

**ON CONGRUENCE-SEMISIMPLE SEMIRINGS AND THE  
 $K_0$ -GROUP CHARACTERIZATION OF ULTRAMATRICIAL  
ALGEBRAS OVER SEMIFIELDS**

YEFIM KATSOV, TRAN GIANG NAM, AND JENS ZUMBRÄGEL

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we provide a complete description of congruence-semisimple semirings and introduce the pre-ordered abelian Grothendieck groups  $K_0(S)$  and  $SK_0(S)$  of the isomorphism classes of the finitely generated projective and strongly projective  $S$ -semimodules, respectively, over an arbitrary semiring  $S$ . We prove that the  $SK_0$ -groups and  $K_0$ -groups are complete invariants of, *i.e.*, completely classify, ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$ . Consequently, we show that the  $SK_0$ -groups completely characterize zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings.

1. INTRODUCTION

As is well-known (see, for example, [5]), projective modules play a fundamental role in developing of algebraic  $K$ -theory which, in turn, has crucial outcomes in many areas of modern mathematics such as topology, geometry, number theory, functional analysis, etc. In short, algebraic  $K$ -theory is a study of groups of the isomorphism classes of algebraic objects, the first of which is  $K_0(R)$ , Grothendieck's group of the isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective  $R$ -modules, and that is used to create a sort of dimension for  $R$ -modules that lack a basis. Therefore, the structure theory of projective modules is certainly of a great interest and importance.

Semirings, semimodules, and their applications, arise in various branches of mathematics, computer science, quantum physics, and many other areas of science (see, for example, [12] and [11]). As algebraic structures, semirings certainly are the most natural generalization of such (at first glance different) algebraic concepts as rings and bounded distributive lattices, and therefore, they form a very natural and exciting ground for furthering the structure theory of projective (semi)modules in a “non-additive” categorical setting. And, in fact, the structure theory of projective semimodules has been recently considered by several authors (see, *e.g.*, [25], [34], [27], [19], [23], [33], [22] and [20]). Also, in the last one or two decades, there can be observed an intensively growing substantial interest in additively idempotent semirings, which particularly include the Boolean and tropical semifields and have a fundamental meaning in such relatively new, “non-traditional”, and fascinating areas of modern mathematics such as tropical geometry [35] and [10], tropical/supertropical algebra [21],  $\mathbb{F}_1$ -geometry [6], and the geometry of blueprints [31].

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16Y60, 16E20, 18G05.

The second author is supported by the Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under Grant 101.04-2017.19.

Although, in general, describing the structure of (finitely generated) projective semimodules seems to be a quite difficult task, recently there have been obtained a number of interesting results regarding structures of projective semimodules over special classes of semirings among which we mention, for example, the following ones. Il'in et al. [20] initiated a homological structure theory of semirings and investigated semirings all of whose cyclic semimodules are projective; Izhakian et al. [23] characterized finitely generated projective semimodules over a tropical semifield in terms of rank functions of semimodules; and Macpherson [33] classified projective semimodules over additively idempotent semirings that are free on a monoid. Further, motivated by direct sum decompositions of subsemimodules of free semimodules over a tropical semifield and related structures, Izhakian et al. [22] developed a theory of the decomposition socle,  $\text{dsoc}(M)$ , for zerosumfree semimodules  $M$ . In particular, they provided a criterion for zerosumfree semirings  $S$  when  $\text{dsoc}(S) = S$  ([22, Thm. 3.3]) and established the uniqueness of direct sum decompositions for some special finitely generated projective semimodules ([22, Cor. 3.4]), called ‘*strongly projective*’ in the present paper, over such semirings.

Moreover, Elliott [8] classified/characterized ultramatricial algebras over an arbitrary field by means of their pointed ordered Grothendieck groups  $K_0$ . This fundamental result implies a  $C^*$ -algebra technique and initiated very fruitful research lines in algebra and operator algebra, not to mention that the Elliott program of classifying simple nuclear separable  $C^*$ -algebras by  $K$ -theoretic invariants became a profoundly active area of research (see, *e.g.*, the survey paper by Elliott and Toms [9]).

In light of the two previous paragraphs and motivated by the Elliott program of classifying  $C^*$ -algebras in terms of  $K$ -theory, our paper has a twofold goal: to characterize the decomposition socles and structure of (finitely generated) projective semimodules over a semiring  $S$  in terms of the Grothendieck group  $K_0(S)$  of a semiring  $S$ ; and to extend Elliott’s classification of ultramatricial algebras to a “non-additive” semiring setting. Let us briefly clarify the latter: If  $F$  is a (semi)field and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a class of unital  $F$ -algebras, then one says that the  $K_0$ -group is a *complete invariant* for algebras in  $\mathcal{C}$ , or that  $K_0$  *completely classifies*  $F$ -algebras in  $\mathcal{C}$ , if any  $F$ -algebras  $R$  and  $S$  from  $\mathcal{C}$  are isomorphic as  $F$ -algebras iff there is a group isomorphism  $K_0(R) \cong K_0(S)$  which respects the natural pre-order structure of the  $K_0$ -groups and their order-units. It should be mentioned that the “blueprints” of Lorscheid [31] contain commutative semirings as a full subcategory, which eventually leads to a  $K$ -theory of blueprints, including a  $K$ -theory of commutative semirings as a special case, and the group  $K_0(S)$  of a semiring  $S$  has been introduced by Di Nola and Russo [7]. However, the considerations of  $K_0(S)$  in our paper are distinguished from those in [31] and [7] — we consider two quite different types of  $K_0$ -groups and, to the extend of our knowledge, at the first time use them as complete invariants for classifying algebras of a non-additive category in the spirit of the Elliot program.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, for the reader’s convenience, we briefly collect the necessary notions and facts on semirings and semimodules. Subsequently, we provide in Section 3 a full description of congruence-semisimple semirings (Theorem 3.4) and show that zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings are precisely matricial algebras over the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$  (Corollary 3.5). In Section 4, beyond of some basic considerations of strongly projective semimodules

under change of semirings (Propositions 4.8 and 4.10), we give a complete description of the strongly projective semimodules over an arbitrary semisimple semiring (Theorems 4.5 and 4.9).

Based on the results of Section 4 and [13, Ch. 15], in Section 5 we introduce and establish fundamental properties of the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  ( $\mathcal{SV}(S)$ ) of the isomorphism classes of finitely generated (strongly) projective semimodules over a semiring  $S$  and show that those monoids completely characterize the class of ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$  (Theorems 5.10 and 5.11).

In Section 6, using the results of Sections 4 and 5, we consider the pre-ordered abelian groups  $K_0(S)$  and  $SK_0(S)$ —which are the Grothendieck groups on the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$ , respectively—for an arbitrary semiring  $S$ , and, using the concept of ‘*weak dimension*’ of semimodules, describe division semirings  $D$  having the groups  $K_0(D)$  and  $SK_0(D)$  to be isomorphic (Theorem 6.10). Also, it is shown (Proposition 6.7) that, for any additively idempotent commutative semiring  $S$ , the group  $K_0(S)$  always contains a free abelian group with countably infinite basis; and it is given (Theorem 6.14) for semirings  $S$  having  $\text{dsoc}(S) = S$ , *i.e.*, *congruence-semisimple* semirings here, a  $K$ -theory version of [22, Cor. 3.4]. Finally, we extend Elliott’s classification theorem for ultramatricial algebras over fields [8] and show that the  $SK_0$ -groups and  $K_0$ -groups are complete invariants of ultramatricial algebras over semifields (Theorems 6.21 and 6.23), as well as that  $SK_0$  completely classifies zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings (Theorem 6.22).

All notions and facts of categorical algebra, used here without any comments, can be found in [32]; for notions and facts from semiring theory we refer to [12].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Recall [12] that a *semiring* is an algebra  $(S, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $(S, +, 0)$  is a commutative monoid with identity element 0;
- (2)  $(S, \cdot, 1)$  is a monoid with identity element 1;
- (3) multiplication distributes over addition from either side;
- (4)  $0s = 0 = s0$  for all  $s \in S$ .

Given two semirings  $S$  and  $S'$ , a map  $\varphi: S \rightarrow S'$  is a *homomorphism* if it satisfies  $\varphi(0) = 0$ ,  $\varphi(1) = 1$ ,  $\varphi(x + y) = \varphi(x) + \varphi(y)$  and  $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$  for all  $x, y \in S$ .

A semiring  $S$  is *commutative* if  $(S, \cdot, 0)$  is a commutative monoid; and  $S$  is *entire* if  $ab = 0$  implies that  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$  for all  $a, b \in S$ . The semiring  $S$  is a *division semiring* if  $(S \setminus \{0\}, \cdot, 1)$  is a group; and  $S$  is a *semifield* if it is a commutative division semiring. An element  $e$  in a given semiring  $S$  is *idempotent* if  $e^2 = e$ ; and an idempotent  $e \in S$  is *strong* if there exists an idempotent  $f \in S$  such that  $e + f = 1$  and  $ef = 0 = fe$ . Two idempotents  $e, f \in S$  are *orthogonal* if  $ef = 0 = fe$ . An idempotent is *primitive* if it cannot be written as the sum of two nonzero orthogonal idempotents.

As usual, a right  $S$ -*semimodule* over a given semiring  $S$  is a commutative monoid  $(M, +, 0_M)$  together with a scalar multiplication  $(m, s) \mapsto ms$  from  $M \times S$  to  $M$  which satisfies the identities  $m(ss') = (ms)s'$ ,  $(m + m')s = ms + m's$ ,  $m(s + s') = ms + ms'$ ,  $m1 = m$ ,  $0_M s = 0_M = m0$  for all  $s, s' \in S$  and  $m, m' \in M$ . Left semimodules over  $S$  and homomorphisms between semimodules are defined in the standard manner. An  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  is called a *module* if its additive reduct  $(M, +, 0_M)$  is an abelian group. Let henceforth  $\mathcal{M}$  be the variety of commutative monoids, and

let  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  ${}_S\mathcal{M}$  denote the categories of right and left  $S$ -semimodules, respectively, over a semiring  $S$ .

Recall [24, Def. 3.1] the tensor product bifunctor  $- \otimes -: \mathcal{M}_S \times {}_S\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , which for a right semimodule  $A \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  and a left semimodule  $B \in |{}_S\mathcal{M}|$  can be described as the factor monoid  $F/\sigma$  of the free monoid  $F \in |\mathcal{M}|$ , generated by the Cartesian product  $A \times B$ , factorized with respect to the congruence  $\sigma$  on  $F$  generated by the ordered pairs having the form

$$\langle (a_1 + a_2, b), (a_1, b) + (a_2, b) \rangle, \langle (a, b_1 + b_2), (a, b_1) + (a, b_2) \rangle, \langle (as, b), (a, sb) \rangle,$$

with  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ ,  $b_1, b_2 \in B$  and  $s \in S$ .

An  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  is called (*additively idempotent* (resp., *zerosumfree*) if  $m + m = m$  for all  $m \in M$  (resp., if  $m + m' = 0$  implies  $m = m' = 0$  for all  $m, m' \in M$ ); clearly, every idempotent semimodule is zerosumfree. In particular, a semiring  $S$  is *additively idempotent* (resp., *zerosumfree*, a *ring*) if  $S_S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  as a semimodule is idempotent (resp., zerosumfree, a module). Two well-known important examples of additively idempotent semirings are the *Boolean semifield*  $\mathbb{B} := (\{0, 1\}, \max, \min, 0, 1)$  and the *tropical semifield*  $\mathbb{T} := (\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \max, +, -\infty, 0)$ .

By an  $S$ -algebra  $A$  over a given commutative semiring  $S$  we mean the data of an  $S$ -semimodule  $A$  and of an associate multiplication on  $A$  that is bilinear with respect to the operations of the  $S$ -semimodule  $A$ . For example, every semiring may be considered as a  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ -algebra and any additively idempotent semiring as a  $\mathbb{B}$ -algebra. An  $S$ -algebra  $A$  is called *unital* if the multiplication on  $A$  has a neutral element  $1_A$ , i.e.,  $a1_A = a = 1_Aa$  for all  $a \in A$ .

As usual (see, for example, [12, Ch. 17]), if  $S$  is a semiring, then in the category  $\mathcal{M}_S$ , a *free* right semimodule  $F$  with basis set  $I$  is a direct sum (a coproduct) of  $I$  copies of  $S_S$ , i.e.,  $F = \bigoplus_{i \in I} S_i$  where  $S_i \cong S_S$  for  $i \in I$ . Accordingly, a projective semimodule in  $\mathcal{M}_S$  is defined to be a retract of a free semimodule, i.e., a right semimodule  $P$  is called *projective* if there is a free right semimodule  $F$  with homomorphisms  $f: F \rightarrow P$  and  $g: P \rightarrow F$  such that  $f \circ g = \text{id}_P$ . And a semimodule  $M_S$  is *finitely generated* if it is a homomorphic image of a free semimodule with finite basis set. Moreover, a semiring  $S$  is said to have the *IBN* (“invariant basis number”) property (cf. [26, Def. 2.8]) if, for any natural numbers  $n, m$ , the free semimodules  $S^m$  and  $S^n$  are isomorphic in  $\mathcal{M}_S$  if and only if  $m = n$ . Note that the “left” version of the IBN property is equivalent to this right version, see [26, Prop. 3.1].

*Congruences* on a right  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  are defined in the standard manner. Any subsemimodule  $L$  of a right  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  induces a congruence  $\equiv_L$  on  $M$ , known as the *Bourne congruence*, by setting  $m \equiv_L m'$  iff  $m + l = m' + l'$  for some  $l, l' \in L$ . The subsemimodule  $L$  is *subtractive* if  $a \in L$  and  $x + a \in L$  (where  $x \in M$ ) implies  $x \in L$ . In this case, the zero class  $[0]$  with respect to  $\equiv_L$  coincides with  $L$ . A nonzero right  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  is called *congruence-simple* if its only congruences are the *identity congruence*  $\Delta_M := \{(m, m) \mid m \in M\}$  and the *universal congruence*  $M \times M$  — in this case, its only subtractive subsemimodules are  $\{0\}$  and  $M$ . Accordingly, a right ideal  $I$  of a semiring  $S$  is called *congruence-simple* if the right  $S$ -semimodule  $I$  is congruence-simple. And a semiring  $S$  is called *right (left) congruence-semisimple* if  $S$  is a direct sum of congruence-simple right (left) ideals.

Finally, a nonzero right  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  is called *minimal* if it has no proper nonzero subsemimodules, and the  $S$ -semimodule  $M$  is said to be *semisimple* if it

is a direct sum of minimal subsemimodules; in particular, a semiring  $S$  is said to be *right (left) semisimple* if the right (left) regular semimodule is semisimple. As is well-known (see, for example, [16, Thm. 7.8] or [28, Thm. 4.5]), the celebrated Artin-Wedderburn theorem generalized to semirings states that a semiring  $S$  is (right, left) semisimple if and only if

$$S \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \dots \times M_{n_r}(D_r),$$

where  $M_{n_i}(D_i)$  is the semiring of  $n_i \times n_i$ -matrices over a division semiring  $D_i$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . In the sequel, we refer to such an isomorphism as a *direct product representation* of a semisimple semiring  $S$ .

### 3. CONGRUENCE-SEMISIMPLE SEMIRINGS

Providing a full description of the class of all congruence-semisimple semirings constitutes a main goal of this section; and to accomplish it, we need the following useful facts.

**Lemma 3.1** ([18, Prop. 1.2]). *If  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is a congruence-simple right  $S$ -semimodule, then  $M$  is either idempotent or a module.*

**Lemma 3.2** ([18, Lem. 1.1]). *Let  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  be an idempotent right  $S$ -semimodule. Then the relation*

$$x \sim y \iff \text{Ann}(x) = \text{Ann}(y),$$

where  $\text{Ann}(m) := \{s \in S \mid ms = 0_M\}$  is the annihilator of an element  $m \in M$ , is a congruence on  $M$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $S$  be a semiring.*

- (1) *The endomorphism semiring  $\text{End}_S(M)$  of any cyclic congruence-simple  $S$ -semimodule  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is either a division ring or the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$ .*
- (2) *Let  $I$  be a congruence-simple right ideal of a semiring  $S$  such that  $I = eS$  for some idempotent  $e \in S$ , and let  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  be a cyclic congruence-simple  $S$ -semimodule. Then,  $M \cong I$  or  $\text{Hom}_S(M, I) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* (1) By Lemma 3.1,  $M$  is either a module or idempotent. If  $M$  is a module, then using similar arguments as in the classical Schur lemma [29, Lem. 1.3.6], one readily sees that  $\text{End}_S(M)$  is a division ring.

Now suppose that  $M$  is an idempotent semimodule such that  $M = mS$  for some  $0 \neq m \in M$ , and let  $f \in \text{End}_S(M)$  be a nonzero endomorphism. It is clear (see also [1, Prop. 2.1 (1)]) that  $f$  is injective. If  $m' := f(m)$ , then  $\text{Ann}(m) = \text{Ann}(m')$ : Indeed, since  $f$  is injective, for all  $s \in S$ ,  $ms = 0$  iff  $m's = f(ms) = 0$ . And, by Lemma 3.2,  $m = m' = f(m)$ , thus  $f = \text{id}_M$ , whence  $\text{End}_S(M) \cong \mathbb{B}$ .

(2) Assume there exists a nonzero homomorphism  $f: M \rightarrow I$ . Again, it is clear (see also [1, Prop. 2.1 (1)]) that  $f$  is injective. We claim that  $f$  is also surjective, whence  $M \cong I$ . If  $M$  is a module, then  $0 \neq f(M)$  is a subtractive submodule of  $I$ , hence  $f(M) = I$  as desired. Suppose then that  $M$  is not a module, hence  $M$  is idempotent by Lemma 3.1. Then  $0 \neq f(M)$  is also idempotent, thus  $I$  is not a module either, so that  $I$  is idempotent by Lemma 3.1 as well. Now, let  $M = mS$  for some  $0 \neq m \in M$ , and  $a := f(m) \in I$ . Since  $f(M)$  is a nonzero subsemimodule of  $I$ , the Bourne congruence  $\equiv_{f(M)}$  on  $I$  is the universal one. So,  $e \equiv_{f(M)} 0$ , and hence,  $e + as = as'$  and  $e + ase = as'e$  for some  $s, s' \in S$ . From the latter and since  $I$  is idempotent, one immediately gets that  $\text{Ann}(e) = \text{Ann}(as'e)$ ; and by Lemma 3.2,  $e = as'e = f(ms'e)$ , and hence,  $f$  is again surjective.  $\square$

Recall that a semiring  $S$  is *right (left) congruence-semisimple* if  $S$  is a direct sum of its congruence-simple right (left) ideals. Notice that a ring is a right (left) congruence-semisimple ring iff it is a classical semisimple ring, *i.e.*, it is a direct sum of its minimal one-sided ideals. However, in a semiring setting, this fact is not true in general. The following theorem, constituting the main result of this section, gives a full description of all congruence-semisimple semirings and also demonstrates that the class of congruence-semisimple semirings is a proper subclass of the class of semisimple semirings.

**Theorem 3.4.** *For any semiring  $S$ , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $S$  is a right congruence-semisimple semiring;
- (2)  $S \cong M_{n_1}(\mathbb{B}) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(\mathbb{B}) \times M_{m_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{m_r}(D_r)$ , where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the Boolean semifield,  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  are division rings,  $k \geq 0$ ,  $r \geq 0$ , and  $n_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ) and  $m_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, r$ ) are positive integers;
- (3)  $S$  is a left congruence-semisimple semiring.

*Proof.* (1)  $\implies$  (2). Let  $S$  be a right congruence-semisimple semiring, thus  $S$  is a finite direct sum of its congruence-simple right ideals. By applying Lemma 3.1 and grouping those summands according to their isomorphism types as right  $S$ -semimodules, we obtain

$$S_S \cong I_1^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_k^{n_k} \oplus I_{k+1}^{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{k+r}^{m_r},$$

with mutually nonisomorphic congruence-simple right ideals  $I_1, \dots, I_{k+r}$  of  $S$ , where the  $I_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  are additively idempotent  $S$ -semimodules and the additive reducts of  $I_i$  for  $i = k+1, \dots, k+r$  are abelian groups.

Notice that each  $I_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k+r$  is a direct summand of  $S_S$ , so  $I_i = e_i S$  for some idempotent  $e_i \in S$ . By Proposition 3.3,  $\text{End}_S(I_i) \cong \mathbb{B}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $D_j := \text{End}_S(I_{k+j})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  are division rings, and  $\text{Hom}_S(I_i, I_j) = 0$  for all distinct  $i, j = 1, \dots, k+r$ .

Since elements of  $\text{End}_S(S_S)$  are presented by multiplications on the left by elements of  $S$ , and as  $\text{Hom}_S(I_i, I_j) = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ , we infer

$$\begin{aligned} S &\cong \text{End}_S(S_S) \cong \text{End}_S(I_1^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_k^{n_k} \oplus I_{k+1}^{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{k+r}^{m_r}) \\ &\cong \text{End}_S(I_1^{n_1}) \times \cdots \times \text{End}_S(I_k^{n_k}) \times \text{End}_S(I_{k+1}^{m_1}) \times \cdots \times \text{End}_S(I_{k+r}^{m_r}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by noting that  $\text{End}_S(M^m) \cong M_m(\text{End}_S(M))$  for any  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  and positive integer  $m$ , we conclude that

$$S \cong M_{n_1}(\mathbb{B}) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(\mathbb{B}) \times M_{m_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{m_r}(D_r).$$

(2)  $\implies$  (1). It suffices to show the congruence-semisimpleness of a matrix semiring  $S := M_n(K)$  with  $K$  to be either a division ring or the Boolean semifield. To this end, let  $e_{ii}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  be the matrix units in  $M_n(K)$ , so that  $S = e_{11}S \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{nn}S$  with  $e_{ii}S \cong K^n$  as right  $S$ -semimodules for each  $i$ . As was shown in [25, Thm. 5.14], the functors  $F : \mathcal{M}_S \rightleftarrows \mathcal{M}_K : G$  given by  $F(A) = Ae_{11}$  and  $G(B) = B^n$  establish an equivalence of the semimodule categories  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_K$ . Therefore, taking into consideration that  $K$  is a congruence-simple right  $K$ -semimodule and [1, Lem. 3.8], we have that each  $e_{ii}S \cong K^n = G(K)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  is a congruence-simple right  $S$ -semimodule as well, whence  $S$  is a right congruence-semisimple semiring.

The equivalence (1)  $\iff$  (3) follows by symmetry.  $\square$

Recently in [22], introducing and studying the *decomposition socle* for semimodules over zerosumfree semirings, the authors characterize zerosumfree semirings  $R$  such that the regular semimodule  $R_R$  is a finite direct sum of indecomposable projective  $R$ -subsemimodules (see [22, Thm. 3.3]). In light of this and as a corollary of Theorem 3.4, we note a description of such semirings in the class of congruence-semisimple semirings as matricial algebras—a central subject of our considerations in the following sections—over the Boolean semifield.

**Corollary 3.5.** *For any zerosumfree semiring  $S$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $S$  is a right congruence-semisimple semiring;
- (2)  $S \cong M_{n_1}(\mathbb{B}) \times \cdots \times M_{n_k}(\mathbb{B})$ , with  $\mathbb{B}$  the Boolean semifield and  $k, n_1, \dots, n_k$  some positive integers;
- (3)  $S$  is a left congruence-semisimple semiring.

#### 4. STRONGLY PROJECTIVE SEMIMODULES

In [22], a very natural variation of the concept of a projective semimodule has been introduced in a semiring setting, which we here call “strongly projective semimodule”. In the present section, we thoroughly investigate such kind of semimodules over general semirings, semifields and semisimple semirings.

**Definition 4.1** (cf. [22, Def. 3.1]). A semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is (*finitely generated strongly projective*) if it is isomorphic to a direct summand of a (finitely generated) free right  $S$ -semimodule.

**Remark 4.2.** We note a few easy facts on strongly projective semimodules.

- (1) Any (finitely generated) strongly projective semimodule is a (finitely generated) projective semimodule as well, and the concepts of “projectivity” and “strong projectivity” for modules over rings coincide.
- (2) A strongly projective semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  over a zerosumfree semiring  $S$  is zerosumfree as well.
- (3) Let  $(P_i)_{i \in I}$  be a family of right  $S$ -semimodules. Then, the right  $S$ -semimodule  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$  is strongly projective iff  $P_i$  is strongly projective for all  $i \in I$ .

The next observation provides a simple criterion for (strong) projectivity.

**Lemma 4.3.** *A finitely generated right  $S$ -semimodule  $P$  is (strongly) projective iff there exist a positive integer  $n$  and a (strongly) idempotent matrix  $A \in M_n(S)$  such that  $A(S^n) \cong P$ , where  $A(S^n)$  is the subsemimodule of the right  $S$ -semimodule  $S^n$  generated by all column vectors of  $A$ .*

*Proof.* If  $P$  is a finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule, then there is some positive integer  $n$  and a homomorphism  $f: S^n \rightarrow P$  with a right inverse homomorphism  $g: P \rightarrow S^n$ , i.e.,  $f \circ g = \text{id}_P$ . Then  $\alpha := g \circ f: S^n \rightarrow S^n$  is an idempotent endomorphism with  $\alpha(S^n) \cong P$ . If the semimodule  $P$  is in addition strongly projective, there exists, for some  $n$  and some right  $S$ -semimodule  $P'$ , an isomorphism  $S^n \rightarrow P \oplus P'$ . Hence, the corresponding projections are homomorphisms  $f: S^n \rightarrow P$ ,  $f': S^n \rightarrow P'$  with right inverses  $g: P \rightarrow S^n$ ,  $g': P' \rightarrow S^n$ , such that  $\alpha := g \circ f$  and  $\alpha' := g' \circ f'$  are idempotent endomorphisms of  $S^n$  satisfying  $\alpha + \alpha' = \text{id}_{S^n}$  and  $\alpha \circ \alpha' = 0 = \alpha' \circ \alpha$ . Applying now the standard interpretation of endomorphisms of the free right  $S$ -semimodule  $S^n$  as  $n \times n$  matrices over  $S$  yields a (strongly) idempotent matrix  $A \in M_n(S)$  such that  $A(S^n) \cong P$ . The converse direction is obvious.  $\square$

A description of strongly projective semimodules over semifields is our next goal, for which we need the following useful fact. Recall first (see, *e.g.*, [12, p. 154]) that a subsemimodule  $K$  of a semimodule  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is said to be *strong* if  $m + m' \in K$  implies  $m, m' \in K$  for all  $m, m' \in M$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} T_i \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  be a direct sum of minimal  $S$ -subsemimodules  $T_i \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ . Then, for every strong subsemimodule  $K \subseteq M$ , there exists a subset  $I_K \subseteq I$  such that*

$$M = K \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right) \quad \text{and} \quad K \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus I_K} T_i.$$

*Proof.* By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal subset  $I_K \subseteq I$  satisfying the property  $K \cap \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right) = 0$ ; let  $N := K + \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right)$ . We claim that  $M = N$ . Indeed, for any  $i \in I$ , as  $T_i$  is minimal, we have either  $N \cap T_i = 0$  or  $N \cap T_i = T_i$ . Suppose that  $N \cap T_i = 0$  for some  $i \in I$ . Then let  $J := I_K \cup \{i\}$ , and for any  $x \in K \cap \left( \bigoplus_{i \in J} T_i \right)$  we can write  $x = x_1 + x_2$  with  $x_1 \in \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i$  and  $x_2 \in T_i$ . Since  $K$  is strong, we get that  $x_1, x_2 \in K$ , and thus  $x_1 \in K \cap \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right)$  and  $x_2 \in K \cap T_i$ . From the latter one has  $x_1 = 0 = x_2$  and thus  $x = 0$ . Thus,  $K \cap \left( \bigoplus_{i \in J} T_i \right) = 0$ , contradicting the maximality of the subset  $I_K \subseteq I$ . Therefore,  $N \cap T_i = T_i$  for all  $i \in I$ , whence  $M = N$ .

Now let  $x_1 + x_2 = x'_1 + x'_2$ , where  $x_1, x'_1 \in K$  and  $x_2, x'_2 \in \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i$ . Using the direct sum

$$(*) \quad M = \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus I_K} T_i \right) \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right),$$

we can write  $x_1 = y_1 + y_2$  and  $x'_1 = y'_1 + y'_2$  with  $y_1, y'_1 \in \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus I_K} T_i$  and  $y_2, y'_2 \in \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i$ . As  $K$  is strong, we infer that  $y_2, y'_2 \in K \cap \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right) = 0$ , thus  $x_1 = y_1$  and  $x'_1 = y'_1$ , so that  $y_1 + x_2 = y'_1 + x'_2$ . By (\*) this implies  $x_1 = y_1 = y'_1 = x'_1$  and  $x_2 = x'_2$ , whence  $M = K \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \right)$ . The direct sum (\*) also shows, using the corresponding Bourne congruence, that  $K \cong M / \bigoplus_{i \in I_K} T_i \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus I_K} T_i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5.** *Every strongly projective right  $D$ -semimodule over a division semiring  $D$  is free. In particular, a finitely generated semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$  is strongly projective if and only if there exists a unique nonnegative integer  $n$  such that  $P \cong D^n$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $D$  is either a division ring or a zerosumfree division semiring. Also, the statement is the well-known ‘‘classical’’ result when  $D$  is a division ring. So let  $D$  be a zerosumfree division semiring and let  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$  be a strongly projective semimodule. There is a free semimodule  $F \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$ , which obviously is zerosumfree, such that  $F = P \oplus Q$  for some semimodule  $Q \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$ , and we claim that  $P$  is a strong subsemimodule of  $F$ . Indeed, let  $x, y \in F$  such that  $x + y \in P$ . Then,  $x = p + q$  and  $y = p' + q'$  for some  $p, p' \in P$  and  $q, q' \in Q$ , hence

$$x + y = (p + p') + (q + q') \in P \oplus Q.$$

Therefore, we have that  $q + q' = 0$ , so that  $q = 0 = q'$ , since  $F$  is zerosumfree. This implies that  $x = p \in P$  and  $y = p' \in P$ , and thus  $P$  is strong.

Now noticing that  $F = \bigoplus_{i \in I} D_i$ , where  $D_i \cong D$  for all  $i \in I$ , is a direct sum of minimal right  $D$ -subsemimodules, by applying Proposition 4.4 we get that  $P \cong \bigoplus_{i \in J} D_i$  for some subset  $J \subseteq I$ , whence  $P$  is a free semimodule.



If  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$  is a finitely generated strongly projective semimodule, then there exists a positive integer  $m$  such that  $D^m = P \oplus Q$  for some  $Q \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$ . By the observation above, there exists a nonnegative integer  $n \leq m$  such that  $P \cong D^n$ . The uniqueness of such a number  $n$  follows from the IBN property of division semirings (see [15, Thm. 5.3] or Corollary 5.2 below).  $\square$

Next we illustrate that the concepts of “projectivity” and “strong projectivity” for semimodules, in general, are quite different. It is clear that any  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $M \in |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{B}}|$  is an idempotent semimodule and an upper semilattice under the partial ordering  $\leq$  on  $M$  defined for any two elements  $x, y \in M$  by  $x \leq y$  iff  $x + y = y$ . Let us recall the following projectivity criterion for  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodules.

**Fact 4.6** ([17, Thm. 5.3]). *A  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $M$  is projective if and only if  $M$  is a distributive lattice and  $\{m \in M \mid m \leq x\}$  is finite for all  $x \in M$ .*

By applying Theorem 4.5 and Fact 4.6 it is fairly easy to provide counterexamples demonstrating the difference of the concepts of “projectivity” and “strong projectivity” for general semimodules.

**Example 4.7.** Consider the subsemimodule  $P_{\mathbb{B}} := \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$  of the free semimodule  $\mathbb{B}^2 \in |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{B}}|$ . By Fact 4.6, the semimodule  $P$  is finitely generated projective. However, it is obvious that there is no positive integer  $n$  with  $P \cong \mathbb{B}^n$ , and therefore, by Theorem 4.5,  $P$  is not a strongly projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule.

Now let us consider strongly projective semimodules under a change of semirings. We need the following two functors introduced in [25]. Given any semirings  $R, S$  and a homomorphism  $\pi: R \rightarrow S$ , every right  $S$ -semimodule  $B_S$  may be considered as a right  $R$ -semimodule by *pullback* along  $\pi$ , *i.e.*, by defining  $b \cdot r := b \cdot \pi(r)$  for any  $b \in B$ ,  $r \in R$ . The resulting  $R$ -semimodule is written  $\pi^{\#}B$ , and it is easy to see that the assignment  $B \mapsto \pi^{\#}B$  naturally constitutes a *restriction* functor  $\pi^{\#}: \mathcal{M}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_R$ . The restriction functor  $\pi^{\#}$  for left semimodules is similarly defined. In particular, the restriction functor  $\pi^{\#}: {}_S\mathcal{M} \rightarrow {}_R\mathcal{M}$ , applied to the left  $S$ -semimodule  ${}_S S$ , gives the  $R$ - $S$ -bisemimodule  ${}_R S_S = \pi^{\#}S$ . Then, tensoring by  $\pi^{\#}S$  we have the *extension* functor  $\pi_{\#} := - \otimes_R \pi^{\#}S = - \otimes_R S: \mathcal{M}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ , which is a left adjoint to the restriction functor  $\pi^{\#}: \mathcal{M}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_R$ , by [25, Prop. 4.1]. Using [24, Prop. 3.8], we obtain the following observation, which will prove to be useful.

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $\pi: R \rightarrow S$  be a semiring homomorphism.*

- (1) *The extension functor  $\pi_{\#}: \mathcal{M}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$  preserves the subcategory of (finitely generated) strongly projective semimodules.*
- (2) *The restriction functor  $\pi^{\#}: \mathcal{M}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_R$  preserves the subcategory of (finitely generated) strongly projective semimodules if and only if  $\pi^{\#}(S)$  is a (finitely generated) strongly projective right  $R$ -semimodule.*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $P$  be a strongly projective  $R$ -semimodule. There is then a right  $R$ -semimodule  $Q$  such that  $R^{(I)} \cong P \oplus Q$  for some basis set  $I$ . Now according to [24, Prop. 3.8], we obtain that

$$S^{(I)} \cong R^{(I)} \otimes_R S \cong (P \oplus Q) \otimes_R S \cong (P \otimes_R S) \oplus (Q \otimes_R S),$$

whence  $\pi_{\#}(P) = P \otimes_R S$  is a strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule.

(2) ( $\implies$ ). It is obvious.

( $\Leftarrow$ ). Assume that  $\pi^\#(S)$  is a strongly projective right  $R$ -semimodule and let  $P$  be a strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule. Then,

$$R^{(I)} \cong S \oplus A \quad \text{and} \quad S^{(J)} \cong P \oplus B$$

for some right  $R$ -semimodule  $A$  and some right  $S$ -semimodule  $B$ . This implies

$$R^{(I \times J)} \cong S^{(J)} \oplus A^{(J)} \cong P \oplus B \oplus A^{(J)}$$

as right  $R$ -semimodules, thus  $\pi^\#(P)$  is strongly projective.  $\square$

Applying Propositions 4.4 and 4.8, the next result gives a full description of the (finitely generated) strongly projective semimodules over semisimple semirings.

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $S$  be a semisimple semiring with direct product representation*

$$S \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_r}(D_r),$$

where  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  are division semirings. For each  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n_j$ , let  $e_{ii}^{(j)}$  denote the  $n_i \times n_i$  matrix units in  $M_{n_j}(D_j)$ . Then, the following holds:

(1) *A right  $S$ -semimodule is strongly projective if and only if it is isomorphic to*

$$(e_{11}^{(1)} S)^{(I_1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus (e_{11}^{(r)} S)^{(I_r)}$$

for some sets  $I_1, \dots, I_r$ .

(2) *A finitely generated right  $S$ -semimodule is strongly projective if and only if it can be uniquely written in the form*

$$(e_{11}^{(1)} S)^{k_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus (e_{11}^{(r)} S)^{k_r},$$

where  $k_1, \dots, k_r$  are nonnegative integers.

*Proof.* For each  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , let  $\pi_j: S \rightarrow M_{n_j}(D_j)$  be the canonical projection. Then  $\pi_j^\#(M_{n_j}(D_j))$  is obviously a (finitely generated) strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule and  $e_{ii}^{(j)} M_{n_j}(D_j)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n_j$  is a (finitely generated) strongly projective right  $M_{n_j}(D_j)$ -semimodule. Therefore, by Proposition 4.8 (2),  $e_{ii}^{(j)} S = \pi_j^\#(e_{ii}^{(j)} M_{n_j}(D_j))$  is a (finitely generated) strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule. From this and Remark 4.2 (3), we immediately see that the sufficient conditions of statements (1) and (2) are true.

Assuming that  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is a (finitely generated) strongly projective semimodule, we may write it in the form

$$P = (\pi_1)_\#(P) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\pi_r)_\#(P).$$

By Proposition 4.8 (1),  $(\pi_i)_\#(P)$  is a (finitely generated) strongly right  $M_{n_i}(D_i)$ -semimodule for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

Now we consider the structure of a (finitely generated) strongly projective right semimodule over a matrix semiring  $M_m(D)$  for some positive integer  $m$  and division semiring  $D$ . For  $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ , let  $e_{ij}$  be the  $m \times m$  matrix units in  $M_m(D)$ . Then each  $e_{ii} M_m(D)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , is a minimal right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodule, and  $M_m(D) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m e_{ii} M_m(D)$ . As it is clear that, for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ , the  $M_m(D)$ -semimodules  $e_{ii} M_m(D)$  and  $e_{jj} M_m(D)$  are isomorphic, the semimodules  $M_m(D)$  and  $(e_{11} M_m(D))^m$  are isomorphic as right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodules, too.

Again, it is easy to see that  $D$  is either a division ring or a zerosumfree division semiring. In the first scenario, it is a well-known ‘‘classical’’ result (e.g., [29,

Thm. 1.3.3]) that every (finitely generated) projective right  $M_m(D)$ -module can be uniquely written in the form

$$(e_{11}M_m(D))^{(I)} \quad \text{for some (finite) set } I.$$

Thus from now on, let  $D$  be a zerosumfree division semiring, and hence,  $M_m(D)$  is a zerosumfree semisimple semiring. Let  $P$  be a (finitely generated) strongly projective right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodule, *i.e.*,  $P$  is a direct summand of a free right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodule  $M_m(D)^{(J)} =: F$  for some (finite) set  $J$ . As in the proof of Theorem 4.5, it is easy to show that  $P$  is a strong subsemimodule of  $F$ . Also, since  $M_m(D) \cong (e_{11}M_m(D))^m$ , we have that  $F$  is a semisimple semimodule and  $F \cong (e_{11}M_m(D))^{(K)}$  for some set  $K$  (which can be taken to be finite in case  $P$  is finitely generated). From the latter, by Proposition 4.4, there exists a set  $I \subseteq K$  such that  $P \cong (e_{11}M_m(D))^{(I)}$  (and  $I$  is finite when  $P$  is finitely generated).

If  $(e_{11}M_m(D))^n \cong (e_{11}M_m(D))^k$  as right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodules, then it is easy to see that  $(e_{11}M_m(D))^n \cong (e_{11}M_m(D))^k$  as right  $D$ -semimodules, which means that  $D^{mn} \cong D^{mk}$  as right  $D$ -semimodules. From the latter, by the IBN property of division semirings (see [15, Thm. 5.3] or Corollary 5.2 below), one gets  $mn = mk$  and  $m = k$ . Therefore, every finitely generated strongly projective right  $M_m(D)$ -semimodule can be uniquely written in the form

$$(e_{11}M_m(D))^k \quad \text{for some nonnegative integer } k.$$

Finally, we notice that  $e_{11}^{(j)}S \cong \pi_j^\#(e_{11}^{(j)}M_{n_j}(D_j))$  as right  $S$ -semimodules for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , and conclude that the necessary conditions of statements (1) and (2) are true as well.  $\square$

At the end of this section we establish some preparatory results regarding strongly projective semimodules over semirings that are direct limits of directed families of semirings. Let us recall a few general notions from universal algebra (see, *e.g.*, [14, Ch. 3]) in a semiring context. A partially ordered set  $I$  is *directed* if any two elements of  $I$  have an upper bound in  $I$ . Denoting by  $\mathcal{SR}$  the category of semirings, a *direct system*  $\{S_i \mid \varphi_{ij}\}$  of semirings over a directed set  $I$  consists of a family  $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$  of semirings  $S_i \in |\mathcal{SR}|$ , together with semiring homomorphisms  $\varphi_{ij}: S_i \rightarrow S_j$  for  $i \leq j$ , such that, for all  $i, j, k \in I$ , if  $i \leq j \leq k$ , then  $\varphi_{jk}\varphi_{ij} = \varphi_{ik}$  and  $\varphi_{ii} = \text{id}_{S_i}$ . If one defines a binary relation “ $\equiv$ ” on the disjoint union  $\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i$  of the sets  $S_i$  by  $x \equiv y$  iff  $x \in S_i, y \in S_j$  for some  $i, j \in I$ , and there exists  $z \in S_k$  such that  $i, j \leq k$  and  $\varphi_{ik}(x) = z = \varphi_{jk}(y)$ , then this is easily seen to be an equivalence relation. Considering its set  $S := \{[x] \mid x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} S_i\}$  of equivalence classes, it is not hard to verify that by defining

$$[x] + [y] := [\varphi_{ik}(x) + \varphi_{jk}(y)] \quad \text{and} \quad [x] \cdot [y] := [\varphi_{ik}(x) \cdot \varphi_{jk}(y)],$$

where  $x \in S_i, y \in S_j$  and  $i, j \leq k$ , one obtains a semiring  $\varinjlim_I S_i := S = (S, +, \cdot, [0], [1])$  called the *direct limit* of the direct system  $\{S_i \mid \varphi_{ij}\}$  of semirings. It is also easy to check that there is a family  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I}$  of canonical homomorphisms  $\varphi_i: S_i \rightarrow S$  defined by  $\varphi_i(x) := [x]$  for any  $x \in S_i$ , so that  $\varphi_i = \varphi_j \varphi_{ij}$  for all  $i \leq j$ ; and if all  $\varphi_{ij}$  for  $i \leq j$  are embeddings, then all  $\varphi_i, i \in I$ , are embeddings, too.

Our next result, needed in a sequel, is of a “technical” nature and can be justified by using Lemma 4.3 and repeating verbatim the proof of [13, Lemma 15.10] in the ring setting. However, for the reader’s convenience, we briefly sketch here an

alternative, more homological, proof based on the tensor product construction and related results considered in [24] and [25].

**Proposition 4.10** (cf. [13, Lem. 15.10]). *Let  $S$  be a direct limit of a direct system  $\{S_i \mid \varphi_{ij}\}$  of semirings. Then the following statements are true:*

- (1) *If  $P$  is a finitely generated (strongly) projective right  $S$ -semimodule, then, for some  $m$ , there exists a finitely generated (strongly) projective right  $S_m$ -semimodule  $Q$  such that  $Q \otimes_{S_m} S \cong P$ .*
- (2) *If  $P \otimes_{S_i} S \cong Q \otimes_{S_i} S$  for some  $i$  and finitely generated (strongly) projective right  $S_i$ -semimodules  $P, Q$ , then  $P \otimes_{S_i} S_k \cong Q \otimes_{S_i} S_k$  for some  $k \geq i$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Since the semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  is a finitely generated summand of a free  $S$ -semimodule, we can consider all components of a finite generator  $P_0$  to be elements of some semiring  $S_m$ , and let  $Q := P_0 S_m \in |\mathcal{M}_{S_m}|$ . It is easy to see that  $Q$  is a (strongly) projective  $S_m$ -semimodule and  $\varinjlim_I S S_i = {}_S S$  in the category  ${}_S \mathcal{M}$ . Then,  $P = P_0 S = P_0 S \otimes_S S = P_0 S \otimes_S \varinjlim_I S S_i = \varinjlim_I (P_0 S \otimes_S S S_i) = \varinjlim_I (P_0 S_m \otimes_{S_m} S S_i) = \varinjlim_I (P_0 S_m \otimes_{S_m} S S_i) = P_0 S_m \otimes_{S_m} \varinjlim_I S S_i = Q \otimes_{S_m} \varinjlim_I S S_i = Q \otimes_{S_m} S$ .

(2) Since semimodules  $P, Q \in |\mathcal{M}_{S_i}|$  are finitely generated summands of free  $S_i$ -semimodules, the semimodules  $P \otimes_{S_i} S, Q \otimes_{S_i} S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  are finitely generated summands of free  $S$ -semimodules as well. Since any isomorphism between  $S$ -semimodules  $P \otimes_{S_i} S$  and  $Q \otimes_{S_i} S$  is defined by the finite number of their generators and a finite number of elements of  $S$ , and taking into consideration the nature of the congruence relation in the construction of the tensor product, we can consider that all elements of  $S$  involved into the isomorphism  $P \otimes_{S_i} S \cong Q \otimes_{S_i} S$  are elements of some semiring  $S_k$  with  $k \geq i$ . Therefore,  $P \otimes_{S_i} S \cong P \otimes_{S_i} (S_k \otimes_{S_k} S) \cong (P \otimes_{S_i} S_k) \otimes_{S_k} S$  and  $Q \otimes_{S_i} S \cong Q \otimes_{S_i} (S_k \otimes_{S_k} S) \cong (Q \otimes_{S_i} S_k) \otimes_{S_k} S$ , and it is clear that  $P \otimes_{S_i} S_k \cong Q \otimes_{S_i} S_k$ .  $\square$

## 5. CHARACTERIZING ULTRAMATRICIAL ALGEBRAS BY MONOIDS OF ISOMORPHISM CLASSES OF PROJECTIVE SEMIMODULES

In this section, we introduce the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective and strongly projective, respectively, semimodules over a semiring  $S$  and demonstrate their roles in the characterization of the class of ultramatricial algebras over a semifield. The proof of the main result is essentially based on the presentation in [13, Ch. 15].

From now on, let  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  be the set of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules and, for a finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$  let  $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$  denote the class of finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules isomorphic to  $P$ . Furthermore, defining for any isomorphism classes  $\overline{P}$  and  $\overline{Q}$  an addition “+” by  $\overline{P} + \overline{Q} := \overline{P \oplus Q}$ , it is easy to see that the set  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  becomes a commutative monoid  $(\mathcal{V}(S), +, \overline{0})$  with the zero element  $\overline{0}$ . The monoid  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  is always a *zerosumfree* monoid (or a *strict cone* in the terminology of [13, p. 202]), *i.e.*,  $x + y = 0$  implies  $x = y = 0$ .

Let  $\mathcal{SV}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(S)$  denote the submonoid of the monoid  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  consisting of all classes  $\overline{P}$  with a finitely generated strongly projective  $S$ -semimodule  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ , *i.e.*,  $\mathcal{SV}(S) := \{\overline{P} \in \mathcal{V}(S) \mid P \text{ is a strongly projective } S\text{-semimodule}\}$ .

Before presenting “computational” examples of the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$ , we start with some useful observations. Recall that a semiring  $S$  has the IBN property if  $S^m \cong S^n$  (in  $\mathcal{M}_S$ ) implies  $m = n$ , for any natural numbers  $m, n$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *If  $\varphi: S \rightarrow T$  is a semiring homomorphism and  $T$  has the IBN property, then  $S$  has it as well.*

*Proof.* Indeed, if  $S^m \cong S^n$  in  $\mathcal{M}_S$ , then by [24, Prop. 3.8] and [25, Thm. 3.3], one readily has  $T^m \cong S^m \otimes_S T \cong S^n \otimes_S T \cong T^n$  in  $\mathcal{M}_T$ , whence  $m = n$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *Division semirings and commutative semirings satisfy IBN.*

*Proof.* The case when  $S$  is a division semiring was justified in [15, Thm. 5.3]; alternatively, one can use Lemma 5.1 and the fact that for any zerosumfree division semiring  $S$  there is a semiring homomorphism  $\varphi: S \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  into the finite IBN semiring  $\mathbb{B}$ , given by  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\varphi(s) = 1$  for  $0 \neq s \in S$ .

If  $S$  is a commutative semiring, by Zorn’s lemma there exists a maximal congruence  $\rho$  on  $S$ , so that  $T := S/\rho$  is a congruence-simple commutative semiring (*i.e.*,  $T$  has only the trivial congruences). By [4, Thm. 10.1],  $T$  is either a field or the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$ , and hence  $T$  has the IBN property. From Lemma 5.1 it follows that  $S$  has the IBN property, too.  $\square$

**Examples 5.3.** Cases of semirings  $S$ , for which the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  are essentially known, include the following.

- (1) By Theorem 4.5, we have  $\mathcal{SV}(D) \cong \mathbb{Z}^+$  for any division semiring  $D$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{SV}(\mathbb{B}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^+$ . However, Example 4.7 shows that  $\mathcal{SV}(\mathbb{B})$  is a proper submonoid of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})$ . In fact, the monoid  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})$  contains a free commutative monoid with countable basis.
- (2) For any semiring  $S$ , obviously  $\mathcal{V}(S) = \mathcal{SV}(S)$  iff all finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules are strongly projective. In particular, for any division semiring  $D$ , we have  $\mathcal{V}(D) = \mathcal{SV}(D)$  iff  $D$  is *weakly cancellative*, *i.e.*,  $a + a = a + b$  implies  $a = b$ , for all  $a, b \in S$  ([19, p. 4026]). Indeed, by Theorem 4.5, one has  $\mathcal{V}(D) = \mathcal{SV}(D)$  iff every finitely generated projective right  $D$ -semimodule is free, that is, by [19, Prop. 3.1, Thm. 3.2], iff  $D$  is a weakly cancellative division semiring.
- (3) Let  $S$  be a semiring for which every finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule is free. (For example, in [34] and [19], polynomial semirings are considered having this property.) Then the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  are cyclic monoids generated by the element  $\overline{S}$ . If in addition  $S$  has the IBN property (*e.g.*, if  $S$  is a commutative semiring), then the monoids  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  are exactly  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ .

Notice that if  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$  is a semiring homomorphism, then, taking into account Proposition 4.8, we see that  $\varphi$  induces a well-defined monoid homomorphism  $\mathcal{V}(\varphi): \mathcal{V}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(S)$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(\varphi)(\overline{P}) = \overline{\varphi_{\#}(P)} = \overline{P \otimes_R S}$ ; furthermore, it holds that  $\mathcal{V}(\varphi)(\mathcal{SV}(R)) \subseteq \mathcal{SV}(S)$ . From these observations, it is routine to check that  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{SV}$  give covariant functors from the category of semirings to the category of commutative monoids.

Recall that a commutative monoid  $M$  is *conical* if  $x + y = 0$  implies  $x = 0 = y$ , for any  $x, y \in M$ . An *order-unit* in the monoid  $M$  is an element  $u$  in  $M$  such that for every  $x \in M$  there exist  $y \in M$  and a positive integer  $n$  such that  $x + y = nu$ .

Throughout this section, we denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  the category consisting of all pairs  $(M, u)$ , where  $M$  is a conical monoid and  $u$  is an order-unit in  $M$ , with morphisms from an object  $(M, u)$  to an object  $(M', u')$  to be the monoid homomorphisms  $f: M \rightarrow M'$  satisfying  $f(u) = u'$ .

For any semiring  $S$ , observe that  $\overline{S}$  is an order-unit in the conical monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$ . (Note that  $\overline{S}$  is no order-unit in the monoid  $\mathcal{V}(S)$ , unless  $\mathcal{V}(S) = \mathcal{SV}(S)$ .) Therefore, we have an object  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$  in the category  $\mathcal{C}$  defined above. Given any semiring homomorphism  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$ , note that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi)$  maps  $\overline{R}$  to  $\overline{S}$ , so that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi)$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$  from  $(\mathcal{SV}(R), \overline{R})$  to  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$ . Thus,  $(\mathcal{SV}(-), \overline{-})$  defines a covariant functor from the category of semirings to the category  $\mathcal{C}$ .

In order to apply  $\mathcal{SV}$  to direct limits and finite products of semirings, we consider direct limits and finite products in the category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Given a direct system of objects  $(M_i, u_i)$  and morphisms  $f_{ij}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we first form the direct limit  $M$  of the commutative monoids  $M_i$  and let  $f_i: M_i \rightarrow M$  denote the canonical homomorphisms. One can easily check that  $M$  is a conical monoid. Since  $f_{ij}(u_i) = u_j$  whenever  $i \leq j$ , there is a unique element  $u \in M$  such that  $f_i(u_i) = u$  for all  $i$ , and we observe that  $u$  is an order-unit in  $M$ . Thus,  $(M, u)$  is an object in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and each  $f_i$  is a morphism from  $(M_i, u_i)$  to  $(M, u)$ . It is easy to see that  $(M, u)$  is the direct limit of the  $(M_i, u_i)$ .

It is standard how to form finite products in the category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Namely, given objects  $(M_1, u_1), \dots, (M_n, u_n)$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we set  $M = M_1 \times \dots \times M_n$ , which is a conical monoid, together with  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ , which is an order-unit in  $M$ . It is easy to check that  $(M, u)$  is the product of the  $(M_i, u_i)$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** *The functor  $(\mathcal{SV}(-), \overline{-}): \mathcal{SR} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  preserves direct limits and finite products.*

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of [13, Prop. 15.11] to our situation. Let  $S$  be the direct limit of a direct system  $\{S_i \mid \varphi_{ij}\}$  of semirings, and for each  $i$  let  $\varphi_i: S_i \rightarrow S$  be the canonical homomorphism. Let  $(M, u)$  be the direct limit of the monoids  $(\mathcal{SV}(S_i), \overline{S}_i)$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and for each  $i$  let  $f_i: (\mathcal{SV}(S_i), \overline{S}_i) \rightarrow (M, u)$  be the canonical homomorphism. We have morphisms  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_i): (\mathcal{SV}(S_i), \overline{S}_i) \rightarrow (\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$  such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_j)\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ij}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_i)$  whenever  $i \leq j$ ; hence, there exists a unique monoid homomorphism  $g: (M, u) \rightarrow (\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$  such that  $gf_i = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_i)$  for all  $i$ . We are going to prove that  $g$  is an isomorphism.

Given  $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{SV}(S)$ , we see from Proposition 4.10 (1) that there is a finitely generated strongly projective right  $S_i$ -semimodule  $Q$  for some  $i$  with  $Q \otimes_{S_i} S \cong \overline{P}$ . Then  $\overline{Q} \in \mathcal{SV}(S_i)$ , and so  $f_i(\overline{Q}) \in M$ , and also

$$gf_i(\overline{Q}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_i)(\overline{Q}) = \overline{Q \otimes_{S_i} S} = \overline{P}.$$

This implies that  $g$  is surjective.

Now, let  $x, y \in M$  be such that  $g(x) = g(y)$ . Then there exist  $i$  and  $j$  such that  $f_i(\overline{P}) = x$  and  $f_j(\overline{Q}) = y$  for some  $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{SV}(S_i)$  and  $\overline{Q} \in \mathcal{SV}(S_j)$ . Choosing  $k$  such that  $i, j \leq k$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_k)\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ik})(\overline{P}) = gf_i(\overline{P}) = g(x) = g(y) = gf_j(\overline{Q}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_k)\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jk})(\overline{Q}),$$

which means  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ik})(\overline{P}) \otimes_{S_k} S = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jk})(\overline{Q}) \otimes_{S_k} S$ . By Proposition 4.10 (2),

$$\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ik})(\overline{P}) \otimes_{S_k} S_t = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jk})(\overline{Q}) \otimes_{S_k} S_t$$

for some  $t \geq k$ . Then,  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{it})(\overline{P}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{kt})\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ik})(\overline{P}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{ik})(\overline{P}) \otimes_{S_k} S_t = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jk})(\overline{Q}) \otimes_{S_k} S_t = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{kt})\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jk})(\overline{Q}) = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jt})(\overline{Q})$ , and hence,

$$x = f_i(\overline{P}) = f_t\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{it})(\overline{P}) = f_t\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{jt})(\overline{Q}) = f_j(\overline{Q}) = y.$$

Thus  $g$  is injective.

Using the same argument above and Proposition 4.8, we get that the functor  $(\mathcal{SV}(-), \overline{-})$  preserves finite products.  $\square$

The following fact shows that every free commutative monoid of finite rank occurs as a monoid of isomorphism classes of strongly projective semimodules of a zerosumfree semisimple semiring.

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $S$  be a semisimple semiring with direct product representation*

$$S \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_r}(D_r),$$

where  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  are division semirings. For each  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n_j$ , let  $e_{ii}^{(j)}$  be the  $n_i \times n_i$  matrix units in  $M_{n_j}(D_j)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is a free commutative monoid with basis  $\{\overline{e_{11}^{(1)}S}, \dots, \overline{e_{11}^{(r)}S}\}$ , and  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S}) \cong ((\mathbb{Z}^+)^r, (n_1, \dots, n_r))$ .

*Proof.* According to Proposition 5.4, we have

$$\mathcal{SV}(S) \cong \mathcal{SV}(M_{n_1}(D_1)) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{SV}(M_{n_r}(D_r)).$$

Moreover, for each  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(M_{n_j}(D_j))$  is a free commutative monoid with basis  $\{\overline{e_{11}^{(j)}S}\}$ , by Theorem 4.9(2). Using those observations, we immediately get the statement.  $\square$

From Corollary 3.5 and Proposition 5.5 we readily see that every free commutative monoid of finite rank appears as a monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  for some additively idempotent congruence-semisimple semiring  $S$ . Motivated by this remark and the Realization Problem, which constitutes a very active area in non-stable  $K$ -theory (we refer the reader to [3] and the references given there for a recent progress on the Realization Problem), it is natural to pose the following problem.

**Problem 1.** Describe commutative monoids which can be realized as either a monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  or  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  for an additively idempotent semiring  $S$ .

Now we define a central notion for the present article, which has been investigated in Section 3 for a special case.

**Definition 5.6.** Let  $F$  be a semifield.

- (1) A *matricial  $F$ -algebra* is an  $F$ -algebra isomorphic to  $M_{n_1}(F) \times \cdots \times M_{n_r}(F)$ , for some positive integers  $n_1, \dots, n_r$ .
- (2) An  $F$ -algebra is said to be *ultramatricial* if it is isomorphic to the direct limit (in the category of unital  $F$ -algebras) of a sequence  $S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow \cdots$  of matricial  $F$ -algebras.

We note the following simple observation, pointing out that its justification differs significantly from the arguments in the ‘‘classical’’ ring case.

**Proposition 5.7.** *An algebra  $S$  over a semifield  $F$  is ultramatricial if and only if  $S$  is the union of an ascending sequence  $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \cdots$  of matricial subalgebras.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $S$  is the direct limit of a sequence  $S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow \dots$  of matricial  $F$ -algebras with canonical homomorphisms  $\varphi_i: S_i \rightarrow S$ , then  $S$  is the union of the ascending sequence  $\varphi_1(S_1) \subseteq \varphi_2(S_2) \subseteq \dots$ . Therefore, it is left to show that each  $\varphi_i(S_i)$  is a matricial  $F$ -algebra.

This follows, as is easy to verify, from the following claim. If  $R$  and  $S$  are matricial  $F$ -algebras, where  $R = R_1 \times \dots \times R_r$  and  $R_i = M_{n_i}(F)$  for some positive integers  $n_i$ , and if  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$  is any algebra homomorphism, then  $\varphi(R) \cong \prod_{j \in J} R_j$  for some subset  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ ; thus  $\varphi(R)$  is also a matricial  $F$ -algebra.

To prove this claim, note that  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$  as above induces an isomorphism  $R/\ker(\varphi) \rightarrow \varphi(R)$ ,  $\bar{r} \mapsto \varphi(r)$ , where  $\ker(\varphi) = \{(x, y) \in R \times R \mid \varphi(x) = \varphi(y)\}$  is its kernel congruence. Using the congruences  $\rho_i := \ker(\varphi) \cap R_i \times R_i$ , we have

$$\varphi(R) \cong R/\ker(\varphi) \cong R_1/\rho_1 \times \dots \times R_r/\rho_r.$$

We argue that each  $\rho_i$  is a trivial congruence on  $R_i$ , which proves the claim. Now the semifield  $F$  is either a field or a zerosumfree semifield. If  $F$  is a field, then  $\rho_i$  is obviously a trivial congruence, since  $R_i$  is a simple ring.

Assume then that  $F$  is a zerosumfree semifield, and that  $\rho_i$  is not the identity one. There are distinct elements  $A = (a_{jk})$  and  $B = (b_{jk})$  in  $R_i$  such that  $A \rho_i B$ , thus  $a := a_{jk} \neq b_{jk} =: b$  for some  $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n_i\}$ . Denoting by  $E_{jk}$  the matrix units in  $R_i$  and using  $E_{jk}E_{kt} = E_{jt}$ , we readily infer that  $aE_{jk} \rho_i bE_{jk}$  for all  $j, k$ , whence  $aI_{n_i} \rho_i bI_{n_i}$ . This implies that

$$a\varphi(I_{n_i}) = \varphi(aI_{n_i}) = \varphi(bI_{n_i}) = b\varphi(I_{n_i}).$$

If  $\varphi(I_{n_i}) \neq 0$ , then since  $S$  is a matricial  $F$ -algebra we must have that  $a = b$ , giving a contradiction. Therefore,  $\varphi(I_{n_i}) = 0$ , *i.e.*,  $I_{n_i} \rho_i 0$ , which implies  $C = CI_{n_i} \rho_i 0I_{n_i} = 0$  for all  $C \in R_i$ , so that  $\rho_i = R_i \times R_i$  is the universal one.  $\square$

The subsequent fact, which immediately follows from Propositions 5.4 and 5.5, provides some information on the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  for an ultramatricial  $F$ -algebra over a semifield  $F$ .

**Remark 5.8.** Let  $S$  be a direct limit of a sequence  $S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow \dots$  of matricial  $F$ -algebras with canonical homomorphisms  $\varphi_i: S_i \rightarrow S$ , and suppose that  $S_i = M_{n_1^i}(F) \times \dots \times M_{n_{r(i)}^i}(F)$  for some positive integers  $n_1^i, \dots, n_{r(i)}^i$ , for each  $i$ , denoting by  $e_{11}^{(j,i)} \in S_i$  the matrix units in  $M_{n_j^i}(F)$ . Then  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is a cancellative monoid generated by the set  $\{\overline{\varphi_i(e_{11}^{(j,i)})S} \mid 1 \leq j \leq r(i), i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ .

In order to establish the main results of this section, we state the following useful lemma, which proof is essentially based on the one of [13, Lem. 15.23].

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $F$  be a semifield, let  $S$  be a matricial  $F$ -algebra, and let  $T$  be any unital  $F$ -algebra.*

- (1) *For any morphism  $f: (\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{SV}(T), \overline{T})$  in the category  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\varphi: S \rightarrow T$  such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = f$ .*
- (2) *Let  $\varphi, \psi: S \rightarrow T$  be  $F$ -algebra homomorphisms. If  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi)$ , then there exists an inner automorphism  $\theta$  of  $S$  such that  $\varphi = \theta\psi$ . Moreover, if in addition  $T$  is an ultramatricial  $F$ -algebra, then  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi)$  if and only if there exists an inner automorphism  $\theta$  of  $S$  such that  $\varphi = \theta\psi$ .*

*Proof.* There are orthogonal central idempotents  $e_1, \dots, e_r \in S$  with  $e_1 + \dots + e_r = 1$  and each  $e_i S \cong M_{n_i}(F)$  for some positive integer  $n_i$ . For each  $i$ , denoting by



$e_{jk}^{(i)} \in e_i S$  the matrix units, we have that  $e_{11}^{(i)} + \dots + e_{n_i n_i}^{(i)} = e_i$ . According to Proposition 5.5,  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is a free commutative monoid with basis  $\{\overline{e_{11}^{(1)} S}, \dots, \overline{e_{11}^{(r)} S}\}$ .

(1) For each  $i$ , we have  $\overline{e_i S} \in \mathcal{SV}(S)$  and so  $f(\overline{e_i S}) \in \mathcal{SV}(T)$ , i.e.,  $f(\overline{e_i S}) = \overline{P_i}$  for some finitely generated strongly projective right  $T$ -semimodule  $P_i$ . Since

$$\overline{P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_r} = \overline{P_1} + \dots + \overline{P_r} = f\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \overline{e_i S}\right) = f(\overline{S}) = \overline{T},$$

we have  $P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_r \cong T$  as right  $T$ -semimodules. Consequently, there exist orthogonal idempotents  $g_1, \dots, g_n \in T$  such that  $g_1 + \dots + g_n = 1$  and each  $g_i T \cong P_i$ . Note that each  $\overline{g_i T} = \overline{P_i} = f(\overline{e_i S})$ .

Furthermore, for each  $i$ , we have  $f(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S}) = \overline{Q_i}$  for some finitely generated strongly projective right  $T$ -semimodule  $Q_i$ . Because

$$\overline{Q_i^{n_i}} = f(n_i \overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S}) = f(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S} + \dots + \overline{e_{n_i n_i}^{(i)} S}) = f(\overline{e_i S}) = \overline{g_i T},$$

we have  $Q_i^{n_i} \cong g_i T$ . As a result, there exist  $n_i \times n_i$  matrix units  $g_{jk}^{(i)} \in g_i T g_i$  such that  $g_{11}^{(i)} T \cong Q_i$  and  $g_{11}^{(i)} + \dots + g_{n_i n_i}^{(i)} = g_i$ . Note that  $g_{11}^{(i)} T = \overline{Q_i} = f(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S})$ . For every  $i$ , there is a unique  $F$ -algebra homomorphism from  $e_i S$  into  $g_i T g_i$  sending  $e_{jk}^{(i)}$  to  $g_{jk}^{(i)}$ , for all  $j, k = 1, \dots, n_i$ . Consequently, there is a unique  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\varphi: S \rightarrow T$  such that  $\varphi(e_{jk}^{(i)}) = g_{jk}^{(i)}$  for all  $i, j, k$ . Then

$$\mathcal{SV}(\varphi)(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S}) = \overline{\varphi(e_{11}^{(i)} S)} = \overline{g_{11}^{(i)} T} = f(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S})$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Since  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is a free commutative monoid with basis  $\{\overline{e_{11}^{(1)} S}, \dots, \overline{e_{11}^{(r)} S}\}$ , we conclude that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = f$ .

(2) Assume that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi)$ . Set  $g_{jk}^{(i)} = \varphi(e_{jk}^{(i)})$  and  $h_{jk}^{(i)} = \psi(e_{jk}^{(i)})$  for all  $i, j, k$ . Note that the  $g_{jj}^{(i)}$  are pairwise orthogonal idempotents in  $T$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} g_{jj}^{(i)} = 1$ , and similarly for the  $h_{jj}^{(i)}$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , we have

$$\overline{g_{11}^{(i)} T} = \mathcal{SV}(\varphi)(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S}) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi)(\overline{e_{11}^{(i)} S}) = \overline{h_{11}^{(i)} T};$$

hence,  $g_{11}^{(i)} T \cong h_{11}^{(i)} T$ . Consequently, there are elements  $x_i \in g_{11}^{(i)} T h_{11}^{(i)}$  and  $y_i \in h_{11}^{(i)} T g_{11}^{(i)}$  such that  $x_i y_i = g_{11}^{(i)}$  and  $y_i x_i = h_{11}^{(i)}$ .

Set  $x = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} g_{j1}^{(i)} x_i h_{1j}^{(i)}$  and  $y = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} h_{j1}^{(i)} y_i g_{1j}^{(i)}$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} xy &= \sum_{i,k=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{m=1}^{n_k} g_{j1}^{(i)} x_i h_{1j}^{(i)} h_{m1}^{(k)} y_k g_{1m}^{(k)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} g_{j1}^{(i)} x_i h_{1j}^{(i)} h_{j1}^{(i)} y_i g_{1j}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} g_{j1}^{(i)} g_{11}^{(i)} g_{1j}^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} g_{jj}^{(i)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,  $yx = 1$ . As a result, there exists an inner automorphism  $\theta$  of  $T$  given by the rule  $\theta(a) = xay$  for all  $a \in T$ .

For all  $i, j, k$ , we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} x h_{jk}^{(i)} &= \sum_{s=1}^r \sum_{t=1}^{n_s} g_{t1}^{(s)} x_s h_{1t}^{(s)} h_{jk}^{(i)} = g_{j1}^{(i)} x_i h_{1j}^{(i)} h_{jk}^{(i)} \\ &= g_{jk}^{(i)} g_{k1}^{(i)} x_i h_{1k}^{(i)} = \sum_{s=1}^r \sum_{t=1}^{n_s} g_{jk}^{(i)} g_{t1}^{(s)} x_s h_{1t}^{(s)} = g_{jk}^{(i)} x, \end{aligned}$$

whence  $\theta\psi(e_{jk}^{(i)}) = x h_{jk}^{(i)} y = g_{jk}^{(i)} = \varphi(e_{jk}^{(i)})$ . Since the  $e_{jk}^{(i)}$  form a basis for  $S$  over  $F$ , we get that  $\theta\psi = \varphi$ .

Finally, assume that  $T$  is the limit of a sequence of matricial  $F$ -algebras, and that there is a unit  $x \in T$  such that  $\theta(a) = xax^{-1}$  for all  $a \in T$ . Given any strongly idempotent element  $e \in T$ , we have that  $xe = xex^{-1}xe \in \theta(e)Te$  and  $ex^{-1} = ex^{-1}xex^{-1} \in eT\theta(e)$ , where  $(xe)(\overline{ex^{-1}}) = \overline{\theta(e)}$  and  $(ex^{-1})(xe) = e$ , so that  $\theta(e)T \cong eT$ , and therefore  $\mathcal{SV}(\theta)(\overline{eT}) = \overline{\theta(e)T} = \overline{eT}$ . Using this and Remark 5.8, we obtain that  $\mathcal{SV}(\theta)$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi) = \mathcal{SV}(\theta)\mathcal{SV}(\psi) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi)$ , and we have finished the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to state the main results of this section. The following theorem shows a class of semirings in which the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  determines  $S$  up to isomorphism, namely the class of ultramatricial algebras over a semifield. Note that its proof is essentially based on the one of [13, Thm. 15.26].

**Theorem 5.10.** *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$ . Then  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S}) \cong (\mathcal{SV}(T), \overline{T})$  if and only if  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras.*

*Proof.* The direction ( $\Leftarrow$ ) is obvious, so we show the direction ( $\Rightarrow$ ).

Assume that  $f: (\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{SV}(T), \overline{T})$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Using Proposition 5.7, we may assume that  $S$  and  $T$  are the union of an ascending sequence  $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$  and  $T_1 \subseteq T_2 \subseteq \dots$ , respectively, of matricial subalgebras. For each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\varphi_n: S_n \rightarrow S$  and  $\psi_n: T_n \rightarrow T$  denote the corresponding inclusion maps. We prove first the following useful claims.

*Claim 1:* If  $\alpha: T_k \rightarrow S_n$  is an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n\alpha) = f^{-1}\mathcal{SV}(\psi_k)$ , then there exist an integer  $j > k$  and an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta: S_n \rightarrow T_j$  such that  $\psi_j\beta\alpha = \psi_k$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_j\beta) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n)$ .

*Proof of the claim.* By Lemma 5.9(1), there exists an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta': S_n \rightarrow T$  such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\beta') = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n)$ . Since  $S_n$  is a free  $F$ -semimodule of finite rank, we must have  $\beta'(S_n) \subseteq T_i$  for some  $i$ . Then  $\beta'$  defines an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta'': S_n \rightarrow T_i$  such that  $\psi_i\beta'' = \beta'$ , and we have  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_i\beta'') = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n)$ . This implies that

$$\mathcal{SV}(\psi_i\beta''\alpha) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n)\mathcal{SV}(\alpha) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n\alpha) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi_k).$$

Applying Lemma 5.9(2), there exists an inner automorphism  $\theta$  of  $T$  such that  $\psi_k = \theta\psi_i\beta''\alpha$ . Since  $T_i$  is also a free  $F$ -semimodule of finite rank, there exists an integer  $j > k$  such that  $\theta(T_i) \subseteq T_j$ . Then  $\theta$  defines an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\theta': T_i \rightarrow T_j$  such that  $\psi_j\theta' = \theta\psi_i$ . Set  $\beta = \theta'\beta''$ , so that  $\beta$  is an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism from  $S_n$  into  $T_j$  and  $\psi_j\beta\alpha = \psi_j\theta'\beta''\alpha = \theta\psi_i\beta''\alpha = \psi_k$ . Using Lemma 5.9(2), we see that

$$\mathcal{SV}(\psi_j\beta) = \mathcal{SV}(\psi\theta'\beta'') = \mathcal{SV}(\theta\psi_i\beta'') = \mathcal{SV}(\psi_i\beta'') = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n).$$

Thus, the claim is proved.

Similarly, we get the following claim.

*Claim 2:* If  $\alpha: S_n \rightarrow T_k$  is an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_k\alpha) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_n)$ , then there exist an integer  $m > n$  and an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta: T_k \rightarrow S_m$  such that  $\varphi_m\beta\alpha = \varphi_n$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_m\beta) = f^{-1}\mathcal{SV}(\psi_k)$ .

We next construct positive integers  $n(1) < n(2) < \dots$  and  $F$ -algebra homomorphisms  $\beta_k: S_{n(k)} \rightarrow T$  such that:

- (a) For all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , we have  $T_k \subseteq \beta_k(S_{n(k)})$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\beta_k) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(k)})$ .
- (b) For all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , it is  $\beta_k$  injective and  $\beta_{k+1}$  an extension of  $\beta_k$ .

By Lemma 5.9(1), there exists an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\alpha': T_1 \rightarrow S$  such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\alpha') = f^{-1}\mathcal{SV}(\psi_1)$ . Because  $T_1$  is free  $F$ -semimodule of finite rank, we have

$\alpha'(T_1) \subseteq S_{n(1)}$  for some positive integer  $n(1)$ . Then  $\alpha'$  defines an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\alpha: T_1 \rightarrow S_{n(1)}$  such that  $\varphi_{n(1)}\alpha = \alpha'$ , and  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(1)}\alpha) = f^{-1}\mathcal{SV}(\psi_1)$ . By Claim 1, there exists an integer  $j > 1$  and an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta: S_{n(1)} \rightarrow S_j$  such that  $\psi_j\beta\alpha = \psi_1$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_j\beta) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(1)})$ . Then  $\beta_1 := \psi_j\beta$  is an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism from  $S_{n(1)}$  to  $T$  such that  $\beta_1\alpha = \psi_1$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\beta_1) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(1)})$ . Moreover,  $T_1 = \psi_1(T_1) = \beta_1\alpha(T_1) \subseteq \beta_1(S_{n(1)})$ , and we see that (a) is satisfied for  $k = 1$ .

Assume that we have  $n(1), \dots, n(k)$  and  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$  for some positive integer  $k$  such that (a) is satisfied up to  $k$  and (b) up to  $k - 1$ . Since  $S_{n(k)}$  is a free  $F$ -semimodule of finite rank, there is an integer  $i > k$  such that  $\beta_k(S_{n(k)}) \subseteq T_i$ . Then  $\beta_k$  defines an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta': S_{n(k)} \rightarrow T_i$  such that  $\psi_i\beta' = \beta_k$ , and we note that  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_i\beta') = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(k)})$ . By Claim 2, there exist a positive integer  $n(k+1) > n(k)$  and an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\delta: T_i \rightarrow S_{n(k+1)}$  such that  $\varphi_{n(k+1)}\delta\beta' = \varphi_{n(k)}$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(k+1)}\delta) = f^{-1}\mathcal{SV}(\psi_i)$ . Since  $\varphi_{n(k+1)}\delta\beta' = \varphi_{n(k)}$ , we get that  $\beta'$  is injective; hence,  $\beta_k = \psi_i\beta'$  is also injective.

Applying Claim 1, there exists an integer  $j > i$  and an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\gamma: S_{n(k+1)} \rightarrow S_j$  such that  $\psi_j\gamma\delta = \psi_i$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(\psi_j\gamma) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(k+1)})$ . Then  $\beta_{k+1} := \psi_j\gamma$  is an  $F$ -algebra homomorphism from  $S_{n(k+1)}$  into  $T$  such that  $\mathcal{SV}(\beta_{k+1}) = f\mathcal{SV}(\varphi_{n(k+1)})$ . From  $\beta_{k+1}\delta = \psi_j\gamma\delta = \psi_i$  and  $i \geq k + 1$ , we get

$$T_{k+1} = \psi_i(T_{k+1}) = \beta_{k+1}\delta(T_{k+1}) \subseteq \beta_{k+1}\delta(T_i) \subseteq \beta_{k+1}(S_{n(k+1)}).$$

Finally, since  $\varphi_{n(k+1)}\delta\beta' = \varphi_{n(k)}$  and  $\beta_{k+1}\delta\beta' = \psi_i\beta' = \beta_k$ , we obtain that  $\beta_{k+1}$  is an extension of  $\beta_k$ . Therefore, (a) holds for  $k + 1$  and (b) for  $k$ , so that the induction works.

Since  $n(1) < n(2) < \dots$  and  $n(k) \geq k$ , we immediately get  $\bigcup S_{n(k)} = S$ . As a result, the  $\beta_k$  induce an injective  $F$ -algebra homomorphism  $\beta: S \rightarrow T$  such that  $\beta\varphi_{n(k)} = \beta_k$ . Then  $T_k \subseteq \beta_k(S_{n(k)}) = \beta(S_{n(k)}) \subseteq \beta(S)$  for all  $k$ , hence,  $T = \beta(S)$ . Thus  $\beta$  is surjective and, therefore, establishes an isomorphism  $S \cong T$ .  $\square$

Finally, we deduce that ultramatricial algebras over a semifield are characterized also by their monoid of finitely generated projective semimodules.

**Theorem 5.11.** *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$ . Then, there exists a monoid isomorphism  $f: \mathcal{V}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(T)$  such that  $f(\overline{S}) = \overline{T}$  if and only if  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras.*

*Proof.* Again, the direction ( $\Leftarrow$ ) is obvious, and we show the direction ( $\Rightarrow$ ).

Let  $P$  be a finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule. Then there is a positive integer  $n$  such that  $S^n \cong P \oplus Q$  for some finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule, i.e., we have  $\overline{nS} = \overline{P} + \overline{Q}$  in  $\mathcal{V}(S)$ , whence

$$\overline{nT} = f(\overline{nS}) = f(\overline{P}) + f(\overline{Q})$$

in  $\mathcal{V}(T)$ . This implies that  $f(\overline{P}) \in \mathcal{VS}(T)$ , so  $f$  induces an isomorphism from  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$  onto  $(\mathcal{SV}(T), \overline{T})$  in the category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Now, applying Theorem 5.10, we immediately get that  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras, as desired.  $\square$

## 6. THE $K_0$ -GROUP CHARACTERIZATION OF ULTRAMATRICIAL ALGEBRAS OVER SEMIFIELDS

The main goal of this section is to investigate Grothendieck's  $K_0$ -groups on finitely generated projective semimodules, whose study was initiated by Di Nola and

Russo [7], and to introduce and examine  $K_0$ -theory on finitely generated strongly projective semimodules, as well as to establish “semiring” analogs of Elliott’s celebrated classification theorem for ultramatricial algebras over an arbitrary field [8]. Consequently, we classify zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings in terms of  $K_0$ -theory.

We begin this section by recalling the  $K_0$ -group of a semiring which was mentioned by Di Nola and Russo in [7, Sec. 4].

**Definition 6.1** (cf. [7, Sec. 4]). Let  $S$  be a semiring. The *Grothendieck group*  $K_0(S)$  is the additive abelian group presented by the set of generators  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  and the following set of relations:  $\overline{P \oplus Q} = \overline{P} + \overline{Q}$  for all  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$ .

**Remark 6.2.** The Grothendieck group  $K_0(S)$  can be described as follows.

- (1) Let  $G$  be the free abelian group generated by  $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$ , and  $H$  the subgroup of  $G$  generated by

$$\overline{P \oplus Q} - \overline{P} - \overline{Q},$$

where  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$ . Then  $K_0(S) = G/H$ , and we denote by  $[P]$  the image of  $\overline{P}$  in  $K_0(S)$ .

- (2) A general element of  $K_0(S)$  has the form

$$x = [P_1] + \dots + [P_m] - [Q_1] - \dots - [Q_n] = [P] - [Q],$$

with  $P := P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus P_m$ ,  $Q := Q_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Q_n$  and  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$ .

- (3) Defining on  $X := \mathcal{V}(S) \times \mathcal{V}(S)$  an equivalence relation by

$$(\overline{P}, \overline{Q}) \sim (\overline{P'}, \overline{Q'}) \iff \exists \overline{T} \in \mathcal{V}(S) : P \oplus Q' \oplus T \cong P' \oplus Q \oplus T,$$

it is a routine matter to check that  $X/\sim := \{[\overline{P}, \overline{Q}] \mid \overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{V}(S)\}$  becomes an abelian group by defining  $[\overline{P}, \overline{Q}] + [\overline{T}, \overline{U}] := [\overline{P \oplus T}, \overline{Q \oplus U}]$  for  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{T}, \overline{U} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$ , and that there is a group isomorphism given by

$$K_0(S) \rightarrow X/\sim, \quad [P] - [Q] \mapsto [\overline{P}, \overline{Q}].$$

- (4) For any finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules  $P$  and  $Q$  we have  $[P] = [Q] \in K_0(S)$  if and only if  $P \oplus T \cong Q \oplus T$  for some finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $T$ .

This follows immediately from (3); see also [30, Prop. I.6.1] for a direct proof given in the case of rings, which serves in our semiring setting as well.

Notice that if  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$  is a semiring homomorphism, then  $\varphi$  induces a well-defined group homomorphism  $K_0(\varphi): K_0(R) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  such that  $K_0(\varphi)([P]) = [\varphi_{\#}(P)] = [P \otimes_R S]$ . From this observation, we easily check that  $K_0$  gives a covariant functor from the category of semirings to the category of abelian groups. This fact was also mentioned by Di Nola and Russo [7].

Furthermore, we note the following useful fact. The proof is quite similar as it was done in the one of Proposition 5.4 (also, we can refer to [13, Prop. 15.11, Prop. 15.13]); hence, we will not reproduce it here.

**Proposition 6.3.** *The functor  $K_0(-): \mathcal{SR} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  preserves direct limits and finite products, where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the category of abelian groups.*

We next consider the  $K_0$ -group of finitely generated strongly projective semimodules over a semiring. Similarly to the group  $K_0(S)$  of a semiring  $S$ , we introduce the following notion.

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $S$  be a semiring. The *Grothendieck group*  $SK_0(S)$  is the additive abelian group presented by the set of generators  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  and the following set of relations:  $\overline{P \oplus Q} = \overline{P} + \overline{Q}$  for all  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{SV}(S)$ .

The Grothendieck group  $SK_0(S)$  can also be described as follows. Let  $G'$  be the free abelian group generated by  $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{SV}(S)$ , and  $H'$  the subgroup of  $G'$  generated by

$$\overline{P \oplus Q} - \overline{P} - \overline{Q},$$

where  $\overline{P}, \overline{Q} \in \mathcal{SV}(S)$ . Then  $SK_0(S) = G'/H'$ , and we denote by  $\widehat{P}$  the image of  $\overline{P}$  in  $SK_0(S)$ .

Similarly to the case of the group  $K_0(S)$ , a general element of  $SK_0(S)$  may be written in the form

$$x = \widehat{P} - \widehat{Q},$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodules. We may also choose a finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $Q'$  such that  $Q \oplus Q' \cong S^n$  for some  $n$ , and rewrite

$$x = \widehat{P \oplus Q'} - \widehat{Q \oplus Q'} = \widehat{P'} - \widehat{S^n},$$

where  $P' = P \oplus Q'$ .

Again, it is not hard to see that  $SK_0(-)$  defines a covariant functor from the category of semirings to the category of abelian groups. Furthermore, we have the following lemma, whose proof is done similarly to the ones of Remark 6.2, and hence, we will not reproduce it here.

**Lemma 6.5** (cf. [30, Prop. I.6.1]). *Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodules. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\widehat{P} = \widehat{Q} \in SK_0(S)$ ;
- (2)  $P \oplus T \cong Q \oplus T$  for some finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $T$ ;
- (3) there exists a positive integer  $n$  such that  $P \oplus S^n \cong Q \oplus S^n$ .

**Remark 6.6.** Let us note the following simple facts.

- (1) For any semiring  $S$ , there is always the canonical group homomorphism  $j: SK_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(S)$ , defined by  $j(\widehat{P}) = [P]$ .
- (2) Let  $S$  be a semiring all of whose finitely generated projective right modules are free. Then the groups  $SK_0(S)$  and  $K_0(S)$  are cyclic groups generated by  $\widehat{S}$  and  $[S]$ , respectively. And, if in addition  $S$  has the IBN property, then those groups are exactly  $\mathbb{Z}$ .
- (3) The group  $SK_0(\mathbb{B})$  is isomorphic to the free abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}$ , but  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$  contains as a subgroup a free abelian group with countably infinite basis. Indeed, the first fact follows from Example 5.3(1), and the latter follows from the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.7.** *For an additively idempotent commutative semiring  $S$ , the group  $K_0(S)$  contains a free abelian group with countable basis as a subgroup.*

*Proof.* We first prove the statement for the case when  $S = \mathbb{B}$ . For any prime number  $p$ , consider the subset  $Q_p := \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . From Fact 4.6 we see that the monoid  $(Q_p, \max)$  is a projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule. We denote by  $G$  the

subgroup of  $K_0(S)$  generated by all elements  $[Q_p]$  and show that the countably infinite set  $\{[Q_p] \mid p \text{ is prime}\}$  is a basis of  $G$ .

Indeed, assume that  $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i [Q_{p_i}] = 0$  in  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$ , where the  $n_i$  are integers and the  $p_i$  are pairwise distinct prime numbers. We may assume that  $n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 0$  and  $n_{k+1}, \dots, n_r \leq 0$ , so that, writing  $m_j = -n_j$  for  $k+1 \leq j \leq r$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k n_i [Q_{p_i}] = \sum_{j=k+1}^r m_j [Q_{p_j}],$$

and hence,  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Q_{p_i}^{n_i} \oplus T = \bigoplus_{j=k+1}^r Q_{p_j}^{m_j} \oplus T$  for some finitely generated projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $T$ .

Since every finitely generated projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule is finite, we get that  $|\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Q_{p_i}^{n_i} \oplus T| = |\bigoplus_{j=k+1}^r Q_{p_j}^{m_j} \oplus T|$ , and hence,  $|\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Q_{p_i}^{n_i}| = |\bigoplus_{j=k+1}^r Q_{p_j}^{m_j}|$ . This implies that  $p_1^{n_1} \dots p_k^{n_k} = p_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \dots p_r^{m_r}$ , and hence, we must have  $n_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Therefore,  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$  contains the subgroup  $G$  which is isomorphic to the free abelian group with countable basis  $\{p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid p \text{ is prime}\}$ .

Consider now the case when  $S$  is an arbitrary additively idempotent commutative semiring. One may readily find a maximal congruence  $\rho$  on  $S$  by using Zorn's lemma. We then have that the additively idempotent commutative semiring  $T := S/\rho$  has only the trivial congruences. By [4, Thm. 10.1],  $T$  is the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$ . Let  $\iota: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow S$  and  $\pi: S \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  be the canonical injection and surjection, respectively. Since  $\pi \circ \iota = \text{id}_{\mathbb{B}}$ , we must have that  $K_0(\pi)K_0(\iota) = \text{id}_{K_0(\mathbb{B})}$ , by the functorial property of  $K_0$ . This implies that  $K_0(\iota): K_0(\mathbb{B}) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  is an injective group homomorphism, and hence, we may consider  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$  as a subgroup of  $K_0(S)$  and finish the proof.  $\square$

The homomorphism  $j$  of Remark 6.6 (1) is, in general, not an isomorphism in semiring setting.

**Lemma 6.8.** *The canonical homomorphism  $j: SK_0(\mathbb{B}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathbb{B})$  is injective but not surjective.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $x = \widehat{P} - \widehat{Q} \in SK_0(\mathbb{B})$  such that  $j(x) = 0$ . We then have that  $[P] = [Q] \in K_0(\mathbb{B})$ , so  $P \oplus T \cong Q \oplus T$  for some finitely generated projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $T$ , by Remark 6.2 (4). For  $P$  and  $Q$  are finitely generated strongly projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule and Theorem 4.5, there exist nonnegative integers  $m$  and  $n$  such that  $P \cong \mathbb{B}^m$  and  $Q \cong \mathbb{B}^n$ . Furthermore, since  $T$  is a finitely generated  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule, we immediately get that  $T$  is a finite set. Then, from the equality  $P \oplus T \cong Q \oplus T$ , we must have that  $|\mathbb{B}^m \oplus T| = |\mathbb{B}^n \oplus T|$ ; hence,  $m = n$ . This implies that  $P \cong Q$ , that means,  $x = 0 \in SK_0(\mathbb{B})$ . Therefore,  $j$  is injective.

From Proposition 6.7 and since  $SK_0(\mathbb{B}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$  by Remark 6.6 (2), we see that  $j$  is not surjective. For the reader's convenience, we also give a direct argument.

Assume that  $j$  is surjective, and consider the projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $P = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$  as in Example 4.7. We then have that there exists an element  $x = \widehat{A} - \widehat{B} \in SK_0(\mathbb{B})$  such that  $j(x) = [P]$ , that means,

$$A \oplus C \cong B \oplus P \oplus C$$

for some finitely generated projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $C$ . Since  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  are finite, we get that  $|A| = |B \oplus P|$ . By Theorem 4.5, we write  $A$  and  $B$  of the form  $A \cong \mathbb{B}^m$  and  $B \cong \mathbb{B}^n$  for some nonnegative integers  $m$  and  $n$ . From these observations,

we must have that  $|P| = 2^{m-n}$ , a contradiction. Thus  $j$  is not surjective, as claimed.  $\square$

In the next theorem we provide a criterion for checking the isomorphism property of the homomorphism  $j$  in a division semiring setting. Before doing this, we need some useful notions and facts. Following [2], a family  $X$  of elements in a semimodule  $M$  over a semiring  $S$  is *weakly linearly independent* if there is no element in  $X$  that can be expressed as a linear combination of other elements of  $X$ . We define the *weak dimension* of  $M$ , denoted by  $\dim_w(M)$ , as the minimum cardinality of a weakly linearly independent generating family of  $M$ . It is not hard to see that the weak dimension of a semimodule  $M$  is equal to the minimum cardinality of a minimal generating family, or the minimum cardinality of any generating family of  $M$ . Recall that a semiring  $S$  is *entire* if  $ab = 0$  implies that  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$  for any  $a, b \in S$ .

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $S$  be a zerosumfree entire semiring, and  $P, Q$  finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules. Then  $\dim_w(P \oplus Q) = \dim_w(P) + \dim_w(Q)$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that  $\dim_w(A \oplus B) \leq \dim_w(A) + \dim_w(B)$  holds for any finitely generated right  $S$ -semimodules  $A$  and  $B$ , so it suffices to prove the converse inequality for finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules, which we may assume to be nonzero. It is easy to see that every projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $T$  is zerosumfree, and satisfies that  $xs = 0$  implies  $x = 0$  or  $s = 0$ , for  $x \in T$ ,  $s \in S$ .

Now let  $d := \dim_w(P \oplus Q)$  and let  $X = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_d, y_d)\}$  be a minimal generating family of  $P \oplus Q$  for some  $x_i \in P$ ,  $y_i \in Q$ . We may assume that

$$X = \{(x_1, 0), \dots, (x_k, 0), (0, y_{k+1}), \dots, (0, y_n), (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}), \dots, (x_d, y_d)\}$$

with all  $x_i, y_j \neq 0$ , for some  $0 \leq k \leq n \leq d$ .

For each  $n+1 \leq j \leq d$ , we have  $(x_j, 0) \in P \oplus Q$  and hence we can write  $(x_j, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^d (x_i, y_i)s_i$  for some  $s_i \in S$ , so that

$$x_j = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i s_i \in P \quad \text{and} \quad 0 = \sum_{i=1}^d y_i s_i \in Q.$$

As  $Q$  is zerosumfree we have  $y_i s_i = 0$  for all  $i$ , and since  $y_{k+1}, \dots, y_d \neq 0$  we get that  $s_{k+1} = \dots = s_d = 0$ ; thus we obtain  $(x_j, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^k (x_i, 0)s_i$ . Similarly, we have that  $(0, y_j) = \sum_{j=k+1}^n (0, y_j)r_j$  for some  $r_j \in S$ , whence

$$(x_j, y_j) = \sum_{i=1}^k (x_i, 0)s_i + \sum_{j=k+1}^n (0, y_j)r_j.$$

From this observation and the minimality of  $X$ , we infer that  $n = d$ .

It is then easy to see that  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  and  $\{y_{k+1}, \dots, y_d\}$  are generating families of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. This implies that  $k \geq \dim_w(P)$  and  $d - k \geq \dim_w(Q)$ , whence  $\dim_w(P \oplus Q) = d \geq \dim_w(P) + \dim_w(Q)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.10.** *For an arbitrary division semiring  $D$  the following is true:*

- (1) *The canonical homomorphism  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is injective.*
- (2) *The homomorphism  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $D$  is a weakly cancellative division semiring.*

*Proof.* Note first that  $D$  is either a division ring or a zerosumfree division semiring. Also, if  $D$  is a division ring, then the group homomorphism  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is always an isomorphism, since every right  $D$ -semimodule is free; that means, the statements are obvious. Consider now the case when  $D$  is a zerosumfree division semiring. We then have a semiring homomorphism  $\pi: D \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ , defined by  $\pi(0) = 0$  and  $\pi(x) = 1$  for all  $0 \neq x \in D$ , and the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} SK_0(D) & \xrightarrow{j} & K_0(D) \\ SK_0(\pi) \downarrow & & \downarrow K_0(\pi) \\ SK_0(\mathbb{B}) & \xrightarrow{j} & K_0(\mathbb{B}) \end{array}$$

is commutative. By Proposition 5.5, we obtain that  $SK_0(D)$  is the free abelian group with basis  $\widehat{D}$ .

(1) Assume that  $j(n\widehat{D}) = [0] \in K_0(D)$  for some nonnegative integer  $n$ . Since the diagram above is commutative and  $j: SK_0(\mathbb{B}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathbb{B})$  is injective by Lemma 6.8, we get that  $SK_0(\pi)(n\widehat{D}) = \widehat{0} \in SK_0(\mathbb{B})$ , that means,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{B}^n} = \pi_{\#}(\widehat{D^n}) = \widehat{0} \in SK_0(\mathbb{B}),$$

so that  $\mathbb{B}^n \oplus \mathbb{B}^m \cong \mathbb{B}^m$  for some nonnegative integer  $m$ , by Lemma 6.5. This implies that  $n = 0$ , whence  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is injective.

(2) The sufficient condition follows immediately from [19, Thm. 3.2] which shows that every projective right semimodule over a weakly cancellative division semiring is always free. In order to prove the necessary condition, we assume that the group homomorphism  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is an isomorphism, and  $D$  is not a weakly cancellative division semiring. Then there exists an element  $s \in D$  such that  $s \neq 1$  and  $1 + 1 = 1 + s$ . Suppose that  $s = 0$ . Then  $D$  contains  $\mathbb{B}$  as a subsemiring. Letting  $\iota: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow D$  be the canonical injection, we have that  $\pi \circ \iota = \text{id}_{\mathbb{B}}$ , whence  $K_0(\pi)K_0(\iota) = \text{id}_{K_0(\mathbb{B})}$ . This implies that  $K_0(\pi)$  is surjective, so that  $j: SK_0(\mathbb{B}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathbb{B})$  is also surjective, contradicting Lemma 6.8. Therefore, we must have that  $s \neq 0$ .

Consider the subsemimodule  $P = \{(d, d)a + (ds, d)b \mid a, b \in D\}$  of the free right  $D$ -semimodule  $D^2$ , where  $d = (1 + 1)^{-1}$ . We then have that  $P \in |\mathcal{M}_D|$  is finitely generated projective, since  $d + d = 1 = d + ds$  and thus the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} d & ds \\ d & d \end{pmatrix}$  is an idempotent one. Since  $j: SK_0(D) \rightarrow K_0(D)$  is an isomorphism, there exists a nonnegative integer  $n$  such that  $j(n\widehat{D}) = [P] \in K_0(D)$ , and hence,  $D^n \oplus Q \cong P \oplus Q$  for some finitely generated projective right  $D$ -semimodule  $Q$ . This implies that  $K_0(\pi)([D^n \oplus Q]) = K_0(\pi)([P \oplus Q])$ , that is,

$$\pi_{\#}(D^n) \oplus \pi_{\#}(Q) \oplus T \cong \pi_{\#}(P) \oplus \pi_{\#}(Q) \oplus T$$

for some finitely generated projective right  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule  $T$ . Furthermore, we have that  $\pi_{\#}(D^n) \cong \mathbb{B}^n$  and  $\pi_{\#}(P) \cong \mathbb{B}$ , so that

$$\mathbb{B}^n \oplus \pi_{\#}(Q) \oplus T \cong \mathbb{B} \oplus \pi_{\#}(Q) \oplus T.$$

Consequently, we must have that  $n = 1$ ; hence,  $D \oplus Q \cong P \oplus Q$ . Now, applying Lemma 6.9, we obtain that  $\dim_w(P) = 1$ , so that  $P$  is free.

On the other hand, by [19, Prop. 3.1],  $P$  is not a free semimodule, and with this contradiction we end the proof.  $\square$



Theorem 6.10 provokes a quite natural and, in our view, interesting question.

**Problem 2.** Describe the class of all semirings  $S$  having the homomorphism  $j: SK_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  to be an isomorphism. Is this class axiomatizable in the first order semiring language?

In order to discuss the combined structure on  $SK_0(S)$  and  $K_0(S)$ , we require the following definitions. Recall [13, p. 203] that a *cone* in an abelian group  $G$  is an additively closed subset  $C$  such that  $0 \in C$ . Any cone  $C$  in  $G$  determines a pre-order  $\leq$  (*i.e.*, a reflexive, transitive relation) on  $G$ , which is translation-invariant (*i.e.*,  $x \leq y$  implies  $x + z \leq y + z$ ), by letting  $x \leq y$  if and only if  $y - x \in C$ . Conversely, any translation-invariant pre-order  $\leq$  on  $G$  arises in this fashion, from the cone  $\{x \in G \mid x \geq 0\}$ .

A *pre-ordered abelian group* is a pair  $(G, \leq)$ , where  $G$  is an abelian group and  $\leq$  is a translation-invariant pre-order on  $G$ . When there is no danger of confusion as to the pre-order being used, we refer to  $G$  itself as a pre-ordered abelian group, and we write  $G^+$  for the cone  $\{x \in G \mid x \geq 0\}$ .

An *order-unit* in a pre-ordered abelian group  $G$  is an element  $u \in G^+$  such that for any  $x \in G$ , there exists a positive integer  $n$  with  $x \leq nu$ . We note that if  $G$  has an order-unit, then any element  $x \in G$  can be written as the difference of two elements of  $G^+$ , whence  $G$  is generated as a group by  $G^+$ .

Throughout this section, we use  $\mathcal{P}$  to denote the following category. The objects of  $\mathcal{P}$  are pairs  $(G, u)$  such that  $G$  is a pre-ordered abelian group and  $u$  is an order-unit in  $G$ . The morphisms in  $\mathcal{P}$  from an object  $(G, u)$  to an object  $(H, v)$  are the monotone (*i.e.*, order-preserving) group homomorphisms  $f: G \rightarrow H$  such that  $f(u) = v$ . Unspecified categorical terms applied to pre-ordered abelian groups are to be interpreted in  $\mathcal{P}$ . For example,  $(G, u) \cong (H, v)$  means that there is a group isomorphism  $f: G \rightarrow H$  with  $f(u) = v$  and  $f, f^{-1}$  monotone (equivalently, there exists a group isomorphism  $f: G \rightarrow H$  such that  $f(u) = v$  and  $f(G^+) = H^+$ ).

**Definition 6.11** (cf. [13, Def., p. 203]). Given a semiring  $S$ , there is a natural way to make  $SK_0(S)$  into a pre-ordered abelian group with order-unit, as follows. First, let  $X$  denote the class of all finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodules, and define  $SK_0(S)^+ = \{\widehat{P} \mid P \in X\}$ . It is clear that  $SK_0(S)^+$  is a cone in  $SK_0(S)$ , and we refer to the pre-order on  $SK_0(S)$  determined by this cone as the natural pre-order on  $SK_0(S)$ . Explicitly, we have  $\widehat{A} - \widehat{B} \leq \widehat{C} - \widehat{D}$  in  $SK_0(S)$  if and only if  $A \oplus D \oplus E \oplus S^n \cong C \oplus B \oplus S^n$  (as right  $S$ -semimodules) for some  $E \in X$  and some positive integer  $n$ .

For any semiring  $S$ , observe that  $\widehat{S}$  is an order-unit in the pre-ordered abelian group  $SK_0(S)$ . Therefore, we have an object  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S})$  in the category  $\mathcal{P}$  defined above. Given any semiring homomorphism  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$ , note that  $SK_0(\varphi)$  maps  $SK_0(R)^+$  into  $SK_0(S)^+$ , and that  $SK_0(\widehat{R}) = \widehat{S}$ , so that  $SK_0(\varphi)$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}$  from  $(SK_0(R), \widehat{R})$  to  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S})$ . Thus,  $(SK_0(-), \widehat{\phantom{x}})$  defines a covariant functor from the category of semirings to the category  $\mathcal{P}$ .

We present the following examples in order to illustrate these notions.

**Examples 6.12.** Let  $F$  be any semifield. Then we have:

- (1)  $(SK_0(F), \widehat{F}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ ;
- (2)  $(SK_0(M_n(F)), \widehat{M_n(F)}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, n) \cong (\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ , for any positive integer  $n$ .

*Proof.* (1) By Theorem 4.5, each element of  $SK_0(F)$  is uniquely written in the form  $n\widehat{F}$  with  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , giving an isomorphism  $(SK_0(F), \widehat{F}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ ,  $n\widehat{F} \mapsto n$ .

(2) Set  $S := M_n(F)$ . As was shown in [25, Theorem 5.14], the functors  $G : \mathcal{M}_S \rightleftarrows \mathcal{M}_F : H$  given by  $G(A) = Ae_{11}$  and  $H(B) = B^n$  establish an equivalence of the semimodule categories  $\mathcal{M}_S$  and  $\mathcal{M}_F$ , where  $e_{11}$  is the matrix unit in  $M_n(F)$ . Then the restriction  $\alpha|_{SK_0(S)} : SK_0(S) \rightarrow SK_0(F)$  is a group isomorphism with  $\alpha(\widehat{S}) = \widehat{F}^n = n\widehat{F}$  in  $SK_0(F)$ . This shows that  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (SK_0(F), n\widehat{F})$ , and hence, we readily get that  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, n)$ , using (1). The group isomorphism  $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}$ , defined by  $\varphi(1) = \frac{1}{n}$ , induces an isomorphism  $(\mathbb{Z}, n) \cong (\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ .  $\square$

For any a semiring  $S$ , similarly to the case of  $SK_0(S)$ , we may make  $K_0(S)$  into a pre-ordered abelian group by defining the cone  $K_0(S)^+$  to be the set of all  $[P]$ , where  $P$  is a finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule. Explicitly, we have  $[A] - [B] \leq [C] - [D]$  in  $K_0(S)$  if and only if  $A \oplus D \oplus E \oplus F \cong C \oplus B \oplus F$  (as right  $S$ -semimodules) for some finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodules  $E$  and  $F$ . However,  $K_0(S)$  has no order-units in general.

**Proposition 6.13.** *For any additively idempotent commutative semiring  $S$ , the pre-ordered group  $K_0(S)$  has no order-units.*

*Proof.* We first prove the statement for the case when  $S = \mathbb{B}$ . Assume that  $[A]$  is an order-unit in  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$ . For any prime number  $p$  consider the subset  $Q_p := \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  and the monoid  $(Q_p, \max)$ , which is a projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodule by Fact 4.6. Since  $[A]$  is an order-unit, we have that  $[Q_p] \leq m[A]$  in  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$  for some positive integer  $m$ , which means that  $Q_p \oplus B \oplus C \cong A^m \oplus C$  for some finitely generated, thus finite, projective  $\mathbb{B}$ -semimodules  $B$  and  $C$ . We deduce that  $|Q_p \oplus B \oplus C| = |A^m \oplus C|$ , so that  $|A|^m = |Q_p \oplus B| = |Q_p||B|$ . This implies that  $p = |Q_p|$  divides  $|A|$  for all primes  $p$ , which is a contradiction.

Now if  $S$  is an arbitrary additively idempotent commutative semiring, by the same reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 6.7, we have homomorphisms  $\iota : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow S$  and  $\pi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  such that  $K_0(\pi)K_0(\iota) = \text{id}_{K_0(\mathbb{B})}$ . Suppose  $U$  to be an order-unit in  $K_0(S)$ . Then, for each  $X \in K_0(\mathbb{B})$ , there exists a positive integer  $n$  such that  $K_0(\iota)(X) \leq nU$  in  $K_0(S)$ , whence

$$X = K_0(\pi)K_0(\iota)(X) \leq nK_0(\pi)(U)$$

in  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$ , which means that  $K_0(\pi)(U)$  is an order-unit in  $K_0(\mathbb{B})$ , contradicting the fact above, finishing our proof.  $\square$

Izhakian, Knebusch and Rowen [22] develop a theory of the decomposition socle for zerosumfree semimodules; and consequently, the authors prove that a zerosumfree semiring  $S$  is a finite direct sum of indecomposable projective semimodules if and only if  $S$  has a finite set of orthogonal primitive idempotents whose sum is  $1_S$  ([22, Thm. 3.3]). In this case, every finitely generated strongly projective  $S$ -semimodule is uniquely decomposed by these orthogonal primitive idempotents ([22, Cor. 3.4]). The following theorem allows us to express these results from the point of view of  $K$ -theory.

**Theorem 6.14.** *For any zerosumfree semiring  $S$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $S$  has a finite set of orthogonal primitive idempotents whose sum is  $1_S$ ;
- (2) the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is cancellative and there exists a positive integer  $n$  such that  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^n, (1, \dots, 1))$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\implies$  (2). Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  be a set of orthogonal primitive idempotents of  $S$  whose sum is  $1_S$ . By [22, Cor. 3.4], every finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $P$  is uniquely written in the form  $P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (e_i S)^{n_i}$  for some non-negative integers  $n_i$ . This implies that the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is cancellative, and the map  $f: SK_0(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ , defined by  $f(\widehat{e_i S}) = \epsilon_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , is a group isomorphism, where  $\{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n\}$  is the canonical basis of the free abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ . Obviously,  $S = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n e_i S$ , hence,  $f(\widehat{S}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . From these observations, we get that  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^n, (1, \dots, 1))$ .

(2)  $\implies$  (1). Let  $f: (SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}^n, (1, \dots, 1))$  be an isomorphism in  $\mathcal{P}$ , and let  $\{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n\}$  be the canonical basis of the free abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ . Then, for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , there is a unique element  $\widehat{P}_i \in SK_0(S)^+$  such that  $f(\widehat{P}_i) = \epsilon_i$ . This implies that

$$f\left(\widehat{\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\widehat{P}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i = (1, \dots, 1) = f(\widehat{S}),$$

so that  $\widehat{\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i} = \widehat{S}$ , since  $f$  is injective. By Lemma 6.5, there exists a positive integer  $m$  such that  $(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i) \oplus S^m \cong S^{m+1}$ , and hence,  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i \cong S$ , since the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is cancellative. Consequently, there exists a set of orthogonal idempotents  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  of  $S$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i = 1$  and  $P_i \cong e_i S$  for all  $i$ .

It is left to prove that each  $e_i$  is primitive. To this end, assume that there exist idempotent elements  $e, e' \in S$  such that  $ee' = 0 = e'e$  and  $e_i = e + e'$ . We then have that  $e_i S = eS \oplus e'S$ , and both  $x := f(\widehat{eS})$  and  $y := f(\widehat{e'S})$  are elements in  $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$ , due to our hypothesis that  $f(SK_0(S)^+) = (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$ . From the equality

$$x + y = f(\widehat{eS}) + f(\widehat{e'S}) = f(\widehat{e_i S}) = \epsilon_i,$$

we immediately see that either  $x = \epsilon_i, y = 0$  or  $x = 0, y = \epsilon_i$ . Suppose that  $y = 0$ , so that  $f(\widehat{e'S}) = 0$ , which implies  $\widehat{e'S} = 0$  in  $SK_0(S)$ . By Lemma 6.5, there exists a positive integer  $k$  such that  $e'S \oplus S^k \cong S^k$ , and therefore,  $e'S = 0$  (since the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is cancellative), that is,  $e' = 0$ . A similar argument applies in the case  $x = 0$ . Thus  $e_i$  is a primitive idempotent, as desired.  $\square$

In order to apply  $SK_0$  to direct limits of semirings, we consider direct limits in the category  $\mathcal{P}$ . Given a direct system of objects  $(G_i, u_i)$  and morphisms  $f_{ij}$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , we first form the direct limit  $G$  of the abelian groups  $G_i$ . For each  $i$ , let  $g_i: G_i \rightarrow G$  denote the canonical homomorphism. Setting  $G^+ = \bigcup g_i(G_i^+)$ , we obtain a cone  $G^+$  in  $G$ , using which  $G$  becomes a pre-ordered abelian group. Notice that the homomorphisms  $g_i$  are all monotone. Inasmuch as  $f_{ij}(u_i) = u_j$  whenever  $i \leq j$ , there is a unique element  $u \in G$  such that  $g_i(u_i) = u$  for all  $i$ , and we observe that  $u$  is an order-unit in  $G$ . Thus,  $(G, u)$  is an object in  $\mathcal{P}$ , and each  $g_i$  is a morphism from  $(G_i, u_i)$  to  $(G, u)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ . It is easy to see that  $(G, u)$  is the direct limit of the  $(G_i, u_i)$ .

Finite products in the category  $\mathcal{P}$  can be formed in a standard manner. Namely, given objects  $(G_1, u_1), \dots, (G_n, u_n)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , we set  $G = G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$  and  $G^+ = G_1^+ \times \dots \times G_n^+$ . Then  $G^+$  is a cone in  $G$ , using which  $G$  becomes a pre-ordered abelian group. Also,  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  is an order-unit in  $G$ , whence  $(G, u)$  is an object in  $\mathcal{P}$ . It is easy to check that  $(G, u)$  is the product of the  $(G_i, u_i)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  (see, also, [13, p. 210] for details).

**Proposition 6.15** (cf. [13, Prop. 15.11, Prop. 15.13]). *The functor  $(SK_0(-), \widehat{-}): \mathcal{SR} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  preserves direct limits and direct products.*

*Proof.* Similarly as it was done in the proof of Proposition 5.4, we may show that the functor  $(SK_0(-), \widehat{-})$  preserves direct limits; hence, we will not reproduce it here. (Also, using Proposition 4.10 and repeating verbatim the proof of [13, Prop. 15.11], we immediately get the statement.)

Using Proposition 4.8 and repeating the proof of [13, Prop. 15.13], we obtain that the functor  $(SK_0(-), \widehat{-})$  preserves direct products, and which, for the reader's convenience, we provide here. Namely, let  $S$  be the direct product of semirings  $S_1, \dots, S_n$ , and for each  $i$  let  $\varphi_i: S \rightarrow S_i$  be the canonical projection.

Let  $(G, u)$  be the product of the  $(SK_0(S_i), \widehat{S}_i)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , and for each  $i$  let  $p_i$  denote the canonical projection  $(G, u) \rightarrow (SK_0(S_i), \widehat{S}_i)$ . We have morphisms  $SK_0(\varphi_i): (SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \rightarrow (SK_0(S_i), \widehat{S}_i)$  for each  $i$ ; hence, there is a unique morphism  $f: (G, u) \rightarrow (SK_0(S), \widehat{S})$  such that  $p_i f = SK_0(\varphi_i)$  for all  $i$ . We are going to prove that  $f$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Given  $x \in G^+$ , there exists a finitely generated strongly projective right  $S_i$ -semimodule  $P_i$  for each  $i$  such that  $p_i(x) = \widehat{P}_i$ . Then, by Proposition 4.8 and Remark 4.2 (3),  $P = P_1 \times \dots \times P_n$  is a finitely generated strongly projective right  $S$ -semimodule such that  $P \otimes_S S_i \cong P_i$  for all  $i$ . As a result, we get  $\widehat{P} \in SK_0(S)^+$  such that

$$p_i f(\widehat{P}) = SK_0(\varphi_i)(\widehat{P}) = \widehat{P \otimes_S S_i} = \widehat{P}_i = p_i(x)$$

for all  $i$ , whence  $f(\widehat{P}) = x$ . Thus,  $f(SK_0(S)^+) = G^+$ . Specially, it follows that  $f$  is surjective.

Now consider any  $\widehat{P} - \widehat{Q} \in \ker(f)$ . For all  $i$  we have

$$\widehat{P \otimes_S S_i} - \widehat{Q \otimes_S S_i} = SK_0(\varphi_i)(\widehat{P} - \widehat{Q}) = p_i f(\widehat{P} - \widehat{Q}) = 0;$$

whence  $(P \otimes_S S_i) \oplus S_i^{k_i} \cong (Q \otimes_S S_i) \oplus S_i^{k_i}$  for some a positive integer  $k_i$ , by Lemma 6.5. Then we obtain a positive integer  $k = \max\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}$  such that

$$(P \oplus S^k) \otimes_S S_i \cong (P \otimes_S S_i) \oplus S_i^k \cong (Q \otimes_S S_i) \oplus S_i^k \cong (Q \oplus S^k) \otimes_S S_i$$

for all  $i$ . Consequently, we get that  $P \oplus S^k \cong Q \oplus S^k$ , whence  $\widehat{P} - \widehat{Q} = 0$ , by Lemma 6.5. Thus  $f$  is injective, and the proof is finished.  $\square$

We are going to present semiring analogs of Elliott's theorem [8] for ultramatricial algebras over an arbitrary semifield. In order to establish the main theorems of this section, we need some preparatory facts and notions.

**Proposition 6.16.** *Let  $S$  be a semisimple semiring with direct product representation*

$$S \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \dots \times M_{n_r}(D_r),$$

where  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  are division semirings. For each  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n_j$ , let  $e_{ii}^{(j)}$  denote the  $n_i \times n_i$  matrix unit in  $M_{n_j}(D_j)$ . Then  $SK_0(S)$  is a free abelian group with basis  $\{\widehat{e_{11}^{(1)} S}, \dots, \widehat{e_{11}^{(r)} S}\}$ , and  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^r, (n_1, \dots, n_r))$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Propositions 5.5 and 6.15, and Examples 6.12 (2).  $\square$

Notice that by Corollary 3.5 and Proposition 6.16, we immediately get that every free abelian group of finite rank may appear as a  $SK_0(S)$  for some additively idempotent congruence-semisimple semiring  $S$ . There are also pre-ordered abelian

groups not being free, which appear as a  $SK_0(S)$  for an additively idempotent semiring  $S$ . We illustrate this by presenting the following example.

**Example 6.17.** Fix an additively idempotent semifield  $F$  (e.g., the Boolean or the tropical semifield) and consider the semiring  $S_n = M_{2^n}(F)$  (for  $n \geq 0$ ) of square matrices of order  $2^n$  over  $F$ . We may consider  $S_n$  as a subsemiring of  $S_{n+1}$  by identifying a  $2^n \times 2^n$ -matrix  $M$  with the  $2^{n+1} \times 2^{n+1}$ -matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}$ . In this way, we have a chain of additively idempotent semirings  $S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$ . Denoting by  $S$  the direct limit of the directed system  $\{S_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ , then  $S$  is an additively idempotent semiring. Moreover, for all  $n$  we have

$$(SK_0(S_n), \widehat{S_n}) \cong (\frac{1}{2^n}\mathbb{Z}, 1)$$

by Examples 6.12, so that using Proposition 6.15 we see that  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (\varinjlim \frac{1}{2^n}\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ ; it is routine to check that  $\varinjlim \frac{1}{2^n}\mathbb{Z} = \{\frac{m}{2^n} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ .

Example 6.17 and the facts above motivate the following natural question.

**Problem 3.** Describe all pre-ordered abelian groups which can be either  $SK_0(S)$  or  $K_0(S)$  for some additively idempotent semiring  $S$ .

**Proposition 6.18.** *Let  $F$  be a semifield and  $S$  a matricial  $F$ -algebra. Then the canonical homomorphism  $j: SK_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  is injective.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that  $F$  is either a field or a zerosumfree semifield. If  $F$  is a field, then  $j$  is obviously an isomorphism, since the functors  $SK_0$  and  $K_0$  are the same. Assuming that  $F$  is a zerosumfree semifield, write  $S$  in the form

$$S = M_{n_1}(F) \times \dots \times M_{n_r}(F),$$

and for each  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n_j$  let  $e_{ii}^{(j)}$  be the  $n_j \times n_j$  matrix unit in  $M_{n_j}(F)$ . Then  $SK_0(S)$  is a free abelian group with basis  $\{\widehat{e_{11}^{(1)}S}, \dots, \widehat{e_{11}^{(r)}S}\}$ , by Proposition 6.16. Therefore, the canonical homomorphism  $j: SK_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  is exactly given by  $j(\widehat{e_{11}^{(j)}S}) = [e_{11}^{(j)}S]$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$ .

Next we show that  $j$  is injective for the case when  $F$  is the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$ . Indeed, assume that  $0 = j(\sum_{j=1}^r k_j \widehat{e_{11}^{(j)}S}) = \sum_{j=1}^r k_j [e_{11}^{(j)}S] \in K_0(S)$  for some nonnegative integers  $k_1, \dots, k_n$ . We then have that  $(\bigoplus_{j=1}^r (e_{11}^{(j)}S)^{k_j}) \oplus C \cong C$  for some finitely generated projective right  $S$ -semimodule  $C$ . Since  $S$  is finite and  $C$  is a finitely generated right  $S$ -semimodule,  $C$  is also finite. We deduce that  $|\bigoplus_{j=1}^r (e_{11}^{(j)}S)^{k_j}| = 0$ , whence  $k_j = 0$  for all  $j$ . Therefore,  $j$  is injective.

We now consider the case when  $F$  is an arbitrary zerosumfree semifield. There exists a surjective semiring homomorphism  $\pi: F \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ , defined by  $\pi(0) = 0$  and  $\pi(x) = 1$  for all  $0 \neq x \in F$ , which induces a surjective semiring homomorphism  $\theta: S \rightarrow M_{n_1}(\mathbb{B}) \times \dots \times M_{n_r}(\mathbb{B}) =: T$ . We then have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} SK_0(S) & \xrightarrow{j} & K_0(S) \\ SK_0(\theta) \downarrow & & \downarrow K_0(\theta) \\ SK_0(T) & \xrightarrow{j} & K_0(T) \end{array}$$

Assume that  $j(\sum_{j=1}^r k_j \widehat{e_{11}^{(j)}S}) = 0 \in K_0(S)$  for some integers  $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 0$ . Since the above diagram is commutative and  $j: SK_0(T) \rightarrow K_0(T)$  is injective, we

have that  $SK_0(\theta)(\sum_{j=1}^r k_j \widehat{e_{11}^{(j)}} S) = 0 \in SK_0(T)$ ; that means,  $\sum_{j=1}^r k_j \widehat{e_{11}^{(j)}} T = 0 \in SK_0(T)$ ; hence  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^r (e_{11}^{(j)} T)^{k_j} \oplus T^m \cong T^m$  for some nonnegative integer  $m$ . This implies that  $k_j = 0$  for all  $j$ , whence  $j: SK_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(S)$  is injective.  $\square$

Before stating the main results of this section, we name another useful notion.

**Definition 6.19.** A semiring  $S$  is said to have *cancellation of projectives* if the monoid  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  is cancellative.

**Remark 6.20.** Let us note the following simple facts.

- (1) Every semisimple semiring has cancellation of projectives. Indeed, this follows immediately from Proposition 6.15.
- (2) It is not hard to see that a semiring  $S$  has cancellation of projectives if and only if the natural map  $\mathcal{SV}(S) \rightarrow SK_0(S)$ ,  $\overline{P} \mapsto \widehat{P}$ , is an injective monoid homomorphism (by using Lemma 6.5). This shows that we may consider  $\mathcal{SV}(S)$  to be the cone  $SK_0(S)^+$  in  $SK_0(S)$ , for any semiring  $S$  having cancellation of projectives.
- (3) Let  $F$  be a semifield and  $S$  a ultramatricial  $F$ -algebra. Then  $S$  has cancellation of projectives. Indeed, this follows immediately from Remark 5.8.

Now we are ready to present the main theorems of this section.

**Theorem 6.21.** *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$ . Then  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (SK_0(T), \widehat{T})$  if and only if  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ). It is clear.

( $\Rightarrow$ ). By Remark 6.20 (2) and (3), we obtain that  $\mathcal{SV}(S) = SK_0(S)^+$  and  $\mathcal{SV}(T) = SK_0(T)^+$ . Let  $f: (SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \rightarrow (SK_0(T), \widehat{T})$  be an isomorphism in the category  $\mathcal{P}$ . We then have that  $f(SK_0(S)^+) = SK_0(T)^+$ , and hence,  $f(\mathcal{SV}(S)) = \mathcal{SV}(T)$ . This implies that  $f$  induces an isomorphism from  $(\mathcal{SV}(S), \overline{S})$  onto  $(\mathcal{SV}(T), \overline{T})$  in category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Now, applying Theorem 5.10, we immediately get that  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras, as desired.  $\square$

Theorem 6.21 is, in general, not valid for semisimple semirings (even, additively idempotent ones). For example,  $(SK_0(\mathbb{B}), \widehat{\mathbb{B}}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, 1) \cong (SK_0(\mathbb{T}), \widehat{\mathbb{T}})$ , but the Boolean semifield  $\mathbb{B}$  and the tropical semifield  $\mathbb{T}$  are not isomorphic. However, as a corollary of Theorem 6.21, the following result permits us to classify zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings in terms of their  $SK_0$ -groups.

**Theorem 6.22.** *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be zerosumfree congruence-semisimple semirings. Then  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S}) \cong (SK_0(T), \widehat{T})$  if and only if  $S \cong T$  as  $\mathbb{B}$ -algebras.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.5, every zerosumfree semiring is a matricial  $\mathbb{B}$ -algebra. Also, every matricial  $\mathbb{B}$ -algebra is an ultramatricial  $\mathbb{B}$ -algebra. From these observations and Theorem 6.21, we immediately get the statement.  $\square$

Finally, according to Propositions 6.3, 6.15 and 6.18, as well as Theorem 6.21, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 6.23** (cf. [13, Thm. 15.26]). *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be ultramatricial algebras over a semifield  $F$ . Then, there exists a group isomorphism  $f: K_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(T)$  such that  $f([S]) = [T]$  and  $f(K_0(S)^+) = K_0(T)^+$  if and only if  $S \cong T$  as  $F$ -algebras.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ). It is obvious.

( $\Rightarrow$ ). Assume that  $f: K_0(S) \rightarrow K_0(T)$  is a group homomorphism such that  $f([S]) = [T]$  and  $f(K_0(S)^+) = K_0(T)^+$ . Let  $S$  be the union of an ascending sequence  $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$  of matricial subalgebras, and  $T$  the union of an ascending sequence  $T_1 \subseteq T_2 \subseteq \dots$  of matricial subalgebras. We then have a commutative diagram in the category of abelian groups as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} SK_0(S_1) & \longrightarrow & SK_0(S_2) & \longrightarrow & SK_0(S_3) & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ \downarrow j & & \downarrow j & & \downarrow j & & \\ K_0(S_1) & \longrightarrow & K_0(S_2) & \longrightarrow & K_0(S_3) & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

From Proposition 6.18 we have that the homomorphisms  $j: SK_0(S_n) \rightarrow K_0(S_n)$  are injective for all  $n$ . Then, taking into account Propositions 6.3 and 6.15, we may consider  $SK_0(S)$  to be a subgroup of  $K_0(S)$ ; and similarly,  $SK_0(T)$  may be considered as a subgroup of  $K_0(T)$ . Then, by our hypothesis, we immediately get that  $f$  induces an isomorphism from  $(SK_0(S), \widehat{S})$  onto  $(SK_0(T), \widehat{T})$  in the category  $\mathcal{P}$ , whence we obtain the statement by Theorem 6.21.  $\square$

Motivated by Elliott's program and Theorems 6.22 and 6.23, we finish this article by posting the following problem.

**Problem 4.** Describe all additively idempotent semirings for which the  $SK_0$ -groups and  $K_0$ -groups are complete invariants.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Y. Abuhlail, S. N. Il'in, Y. Katsov and T. G. Nam, On V-semirings and semirings all of whose cyclic semimodules are injective, *Comm. Algebra* **43** (2015), 4632–4654.
- [2] M. Akian, S. Gaubert and A. Guterman, Linear independence over tropical semirings and beyond, in: *Tropical and idempotent mathematics, Contemp. Math.*, vol. 495, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009, pp. 1–38.
- [3] P. Ara and K. R. Goodearl, The realization problem for some wild monoids and the Atiyah problem, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **369** (2017), 5665–5710.
- [4] R. El Bashir, J. Hurt, A. Jančařík and T. Kepka, Simple commutative semirings, *J. Algebra* **236** (2001), 277–306.
- [5] H. Bass, *Algebraic K-theory*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1968.
- [6] A. Connes and C. Consani, Schemes over  $\mathbb{F}_1$  and zeta functions, *Compos. Math.* **146** (2010), 1383–1415.
- [7] A. Di Nola and C. Russo, The semiring-theoretic approach to MV-algebras: a survey, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **281** (2015), 134–154.
- [8] G. A. Elliott, On the classification of inductive limits of sequences of semisimple finite-dimensional algebras, *J. Algebra* **38** (1976), 29–44.
- [9] G. A. Elliott and A. S. Toms, Regularity properties in the classification program for separable amenable  $C^*$ -algebras, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **45:2** (2008), 229–245.
- [10] J. Giansiracusa and N. Giansiracusa, Equations of tropical varieties, *Duke Math. J.* **165:18** (2016), 3379–3433.
- [11] K. Głazek, *A guide to the literature on semirings and their applications in mathematics and information sciences*, Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [12] J. S. Golan, *Semirings and their Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1999.
- [13] K. R. Goodearl, *von Neumann regular rings*, Pitman, London, 1979.

- [14] G. Grätzer, *Universal Algebra, 2nd ed.*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1979.
- [15] U. Hebisch and H. J. Weinert, On the rank of semimodules over semirings, *Collectanea Mathematica* **46** (1998), 83–95.
- [16] U. Hebisch and H. J. Weinert, Semirings and Semifields, in: *Handbook of Algebra, Vol. 1*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1996, pp. 425–462.
- [17] A. Horn and N. Kimura, The category of semilattices, *Algebra Universalis* **1** (1971), 26–38.
- [18] S. N. Il'in, V-semirings, *Sib. Math. J.* **53**:2 (2012), 222–231.
- [19] S. N. Il'in and Y. Katsov, On Serre's problem on projective semimodules over polynomial semirings, *Comm. Algebra* **42** (2014), 4021–4032.
- [20] S. N. Il'in, Y. Katsov and T. G. Nam, Toward homological structure theory of semimodules: On semirings all of whose cyclic semimodules are projective, *J. Algebra* **476** (2017), 238–266.
- [21] Z. Izhakian and L. Rowen, Supertropical algebra, *Adv. Math.* **225**:4 (2010), 2222–2286.
- [22] Z. Izhakian, M. Knebusch and L. Rowen, Decompositions of modules lacking zero sums, *Israel J. Math.*, to appear; see also arXiv:1511.04041.
- [23] Z. Izhakian, M. Johnson and M. Kambites, Pure dimension and projectivity of tropical polytopes, *Adv. Math.* **303**:5 (2016), 1236–1263.
- [24] Y. Katsov, Tensor products and injective envelopes of semimodules over additively regular semirings, *Algebra Colloquium* **4** (1997), 121–131.
- [25] Y. Katsov, Toward homological characterization of semirings: Serre's conjecture and Bass's perfectness in a semiring context, *Algebra Universalis* **52** (2004), 197–214.
- [26] Y. Katsov, R. Lipynski and B. Plotkin, Automorphisms of categories of free modules, free semimodules, and free Lie modules, *Comm. Algebra* **35** (2007), 931–952.
- [27] Y. Katsov and T. G. Nam, Morita Equivalence and Homological Characterization of Semirings, *J. Algebra Appl.* **10** (2011), 445–473.
- [28] Y. Katsov, T. G. Nam and N. X. Tuyen, On subtractive semisimple semirings, *Algebra Colloquium* **16** (2009), 415–426.
- [29] T. Y. Lam, *A first course in noncommutative rings, 2nd ed.*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 2001.
- [30] T. Y. Lam, *Serre's problem on projective modules*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [31] O. Lorscheid, The geometry of blueprints: Part I: Algebraic background and scheme theory, *Adv. Math.* **229**:3 (2012), 1804–1846.
- [32] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971.
- [33] A. W. Macpherson, Projective modules over polyhedral semirings, arXiv:1507.07213v1.
- [34] A. Patchkoria, Projective semimodules over semirings with valuations in nonnegative integers, *Semigroup Forum* **79** (2009), 451–460.
- [35] J. Richter-Gebert, B. Sturmfels and T. Theobald, First steps in tropical geometry, in: *Idempotent Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, Contemp. Math.*, vol. 377, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 289–317.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HANOVER COLLEGE, HANOVER, IN 47243–0890, USA  
*E-mail address:* `katsov@hanover.edu`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, VAST, 18 HOANG QUOC VIET, CAU GIAY, HANOI, VIETNAM  
*E-mail address:* `tgnam@math.ac.vn`

FACULTY OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PASSAU, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `jens.zumbrägel@uni-passau.de`